UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
3 1761 01332558 4

THE LIFE OF GRANVILLE GEORGE LEVESON GOWER

SECOND EARL GRANVILLE

K.G.

VOL. I.



W. & D. Downey, 57 & 58 Ury Street, Lemon Photo. Emery Walker Ph. Sc.

Granville

THE LIFE OF GRANVILLE GEORGE LEVESON GOWER

SECOND EARL GRANVILLE

K.G.

1815-1891

BY

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE

WITH PORTRAITS

IN TWO VOLUMES—VOL. I.

SECOND IMPRESSION

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.
39 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON
NEW YORK AND BOMBAY
1905

All rights reserved

DA
565
G72 F5
v.1
cop.2

TO

CASTALIA, COUNTESS GRANVILLE

BY HER PERMISSION

I DEDICATE THESE VOLUMES

THE AUTHOR

PREFACE

I DESIRE dutifully and gratefully to acknowledge the goodness of His Majesty the King in sanctioning the publication of the letters of H.M. Queen Victoria and H.R.H. the Prince Consort to Lord Granville which are contained in these volumes

My special thanks are due to the Marquess of Clanricarde for permitting the publication of the extracts from the correspondence between Lord Granville and Lord Canning which occupy a considerable portion of the first volume; to Emily Lady Ampthill for permitting me the use of the series of letters written by the late Lord Ampthill from Berlin during his Embassy there; and to Lord Clarendon for having allowed me to consult his father's papers at The Grove and to publish extracts from several of his letters.

It has been my good fortune to be allowed to use the correspondence, chiefly on Irish and foreign affairs, of Mr. Gladstone, Lord Hartington, Lord Spencer, and Mr. William Edward Forster with Lord Granville; and in this connection my thanks are due to Mr. Herbert Gladstone, the Duke of Devonshire, Lord Spencer, and Mr. Arnold-Forster.

I am indebted to Lord Stanmore for giving me access to the volumes in his possession containing Lord Aberdeen's correspondence. This correspondence, with the papers at Bowood, of which also I have had the use, has been of great advantage to me for the period of history covered by the Coalition Ministry. Mr. John Bright's correspondence with Lord Granville will, I believe, have added much matter of

interest to this work, and I am under special obligations to Mr. J. A. Bright for allowing me to make use of it.

In addition to those whose names I have already mentioned, I desire also to record the obligations I am under to the Marchioness of Dufferin, the Dowager Duchess of Argyll, Lady Sherbrooke, and Lady Tenterden ; also to the late Sir William Harcourt, the Earl of Derby, the Marquess of Bath, the Duke of Norfolk, the Earl of Pembroke, Earl Grey, the Earl of Rosebery, Lord Westbury, Sir Edward Malet, the Earl of Iddesleigh, Viscount Goschen, Sir John Burgoyne, Lord Cowley, Lord Playfair, Lord Herschell, Viscount Wolseley, Sir George Errington, and Mr. Hunt, M.P. ; and to the Hon. Evelyn Ashley in regard to the letters of Lord Palmerston, and to the Hon. Rollo Russell in regard to the letters of Lord Russell.

Sir Charles Dilke has placed at my disposal some valuable notes made by him on current events during the period 1880–1885.

I desire to record my obligations to the Hon. Frederick Leveson-Gower for the information which he has placed from time to time at my disposal in regard to the life of his brother and to family history ; and to Mr. Charles Meade for allowing me to consult some MS. memoranda by Sir Robert Meade, which throw light on several interesting points.

In the chapters which deal with foreign affairs, I have had the great advantage of the advice of Sir Thomas Sanderson, who most kindly placed at my disposal his intimate knowledge of the events of the time, and the results of his long personal and political connection with Lord Granville. From Sir Charles Kennedy and Sir Clement Hill I have received valuable assistance in regard to the commercial questions touched upon in Vol. II. chapter vii.

On various incidental points I have received assistance which I desire to acknowledge from Lord Knollys, from Mr. T. H. Grose, the Registrar of the University of Oxford,

Sir Richard Jebb, and the Rev. W. Brodribb and Mr. A. Bence Jones. I have also to thank Mr. Gerald A. R. Fitzgerald and Mr. J. H. Morgan for the careful perusal of my proof sheets and much valuable help at several stages in the progress of this work.

I have had at my disposal a collection made of obituary notices which appeared in the press at the time of Lord Granville's death in 1891. These notices have been of the greatest service, preserving as they do many interesting traits and personal details, which otherwise might easily be lost to memory. It is impossible to peruse such a collection without realising how much ability is contained in this class of literature, and how inadequate is often the recognition which it obtains. I desire to make special reference to the article 'the Mæcenas of English Liberalism,' which appeared in the *World*, and is known to have been from the pen of Mr. T. H. S. Escott.

Some letters which have been printed in earlier publications have been reproduced in these pages. It seemed to me, when such letters were of importance, that even although they had appeared elsewhere they ought nevertheless to be found in the Life of Lord Granville; and that it was undesirable to make the reader of a biography suffer under the evils with which legislation by reference has made the student of law only too familiar in the pages of the Statute Book.

It is perhaps inevitable that these volumes, to their own disadvantage, will be brought into comparison with a recent publication covering almost the same period of history, by one of the acknowledged masters of English literature—I refer to the Life of Mr. Gladstone by Mr. John Morley. Nevertheless, the close connection of Mr. Gladstone and Lord Granville, both political and personal, for so many years, may be deemed to have had a fitting counterpart in the appearance of their biographies at no great interval of time from each

other, and it may in any case be hoped that these volumes, notwithstanding the superior claims of Mr. Morley's work, may be found to contain some fresh matter of interest for those who study the political records of the last century.

I may mention that the substance of the account of Egyptian affairs in Vol. II. chapter vii., and of the history of the Home Rule question in chapter xiii. of the same volume, had already appeared in articles contributed to the *Quarterly Review* (1887) and to the *Contemporary Review* (1891) by the present author.

E. F.

LEIGH HOUSE, BRADFORD-ON-AVON.
March 27, 1905.

CONTENTS

OF

THE FIRST VOLUME

CHAPTER I

EARLY LIFE

1815–1837

PAGE

The Leveson-Gower Family—Lord Gower and Mr. Pitt—The first Lord Granville—His Mission to Russia—Attachment to Mr. Canning—Appointed to the Hague—Ambassador in Paris—His Children—Lord Leveson—Recollections of his Boyhood and of the Duke of Wellington—Education at Beaconsfield and at Eton—Early Interest in Politics—Devotion to his Mother—Correspondence with his Sister—Friendship with Charles Canning at Eton—Continuation of this Friendship at Oxford—Appointed Attaché to the Embassy of his father in Paris—French Society under the Restoration and the Monarchy of July . 1–25

CHAPTER II

ENTRY ON POLITICAL LIFE

1837–1851

Lord Leveson, Member for Morpeth—Moves the Address—Appointed Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs—His Correspondence with his Father—Agreement of his Views with those of Lord Holland and Lord Clarendon—An Anecdote of Sydney Smith—London Society and Mr. Speaker Abercromby—Marriage with Lady Acton—The Acton and Dalberg Families—Loses his Seat in Parliament—The General Election of 1841—Contest in Staffordshire—Encounter with Mr. Williams on the Hustings—Elected Member for Lichfield—Resignation of the Ambassador—The Whigs in Opposition—Lord Leveson follows Mr. Charles Villiers in his Free Trade Views—Death of the Ambassador—Lord Leveson becomes Earl Granville, and is removed to the Upper House—His Advocacy of Free Trade—Master of

PAGE

the Buckhounds on the Formation of Lord John Russell's Government —Vice-President of the Board of Trade—'Is thy servant a dog?'—'Lord John Russell's Grandmother'—Appointed Paymaster-General—The Exhibition of 1851—Co-operation with the Prince Consort—Speech at the Hôtel de Ville in Paris—Sudden Resignation of the Foreign Office by Lord Palmerston—Lord Clarendon's Position—Lord Granville becomes Foreign Minister 26–45

CHAPTER III

THE FOREIGN OFFICE, DECEMBER 1851 TO FEBRUARY 1852

Lord Aberdeen on the new Foreign Minister—Memorandum on Foreign Policy—Position of Affairs in Europe after the *coup d'état* of 1851—Lord Normanby in Paris—M. Walewski in London—Lord Cowley becomes Ambassador in Paris—Strained Relations with France—Unpopularity of Austria with all Classes in England—Views of Baron Stockmar—Exchange of Views with Count Flahault—Letter to the Prime Minister on the Situation—Correspondence with Mr. Henry Reeve on the Attitude of the *Times* on Foreign Questions—Correspondence with Sir Stratford Canning—Fall of the Government—The Aliens Question—Controversy with Count Buol—Correspondence with the Prince Consort—'*Tu Marcellus eris*' 46–78

CHAPTER IV

THE ABERDEEN GOVERNMENT

1852–1855

Condition of Politics at the Time of Lord Derby's First Administration—Views of Lord Lincoln, Mr. Denison, and Mr. Ellice—Lord Granville's Mediation between the Whig Party and the Peelite Connection—Formation of the Coalition Government by Lord Aberdeen—Lord Aberdeen and Lord John Russell—Lord Granville, Lord President of the Council—The Education Question—Dissensions in the Cabinet—The Crimean War—Objections taken to Lord John Russell leading the House of Commons without holding Office—Lord Granville resigns the Presidency of the Council and becomes Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster—A War of Departments—The Duke of Newcastle at the War Office—Differences between Lord Aberdeen and Lord John Russell—Lord Granville mediates between them—Break-up of the Government—Attack by the Duke of Newcastle on Lord Granville—Ministerial Crisis—Lord Palmerston becomes Prime Minister—Lord Granville again Lord President—Succeeds Lord Aberdeen as Leader in the House of Lords—Views of Lord Granville on the Policy of the Crimean War—Lord Clarendon and Prince Gortchakoff on Italian Policy . . . 79–99

CHAPTER V

THE PALMERSTON GOVERNMENT

1855

PAGE

Lord John Russell at Vienna—Lord Granville and Mr. Layard—Lord Panmure at the War Office—Count Persigny's Conversations with Lord Granville in Paris—Lord Granville on the Conduct of the War—Correspondence with the Prince Consort and the Duke of Argyll—The Duke of Newcastle goes to the Crimea – Motion by Lord Ellenborough in the House of Lords—'The daughters who did not die old maids'—Lord John Russell's Resignation—Failure of the Vienna Conference—General Simpson and Lord Panmure—Lord Granville on Military Appointments—Fall of Sebastopol—Lord Granville at Balmoral—The Duke of Newcastle's Memorandum—Lord Granville's Conference in Paris with the French Ministers—Suspicions as to their Policy 100–124

CHAPTER VI

THE PALMERSTON GOVERNMENT

1856

Lord Canning appointed Governor-General of India—His Interviews in Paris with M. de Morny and the Princesse de Lieven—Letters of Lord Granville to Lord Canning—Austrian Ultimatum—War Committee of the Cabinet—Negotiations with France—Education—Conversation with Lord John Russell at Woburn—Shooting Parties—Lord Canning's Dog 'Rapp'—Chess—Terms of Peace—Miss Nightingale and Lady Palmerston—Macaulay's Account of the Siege of Limerick—Mr. Gladstone and Homer—Dr. Manning—Fall of Kars—Death of Lord Ailesbury—Dinner in honour of the Queen's Speech—Negotiations for Peace—The Austrian Ultimatum—The Emperor of the French on the Proposals of Baron Seybach—Marriage of Sir Robert Peel—Condition of the Tory Party—Prospects of Peace with Russia—Troubles with the United States. 125–147

CHAPTER VII

LORD GRANVILLE'S CORRESPONDENCE WITH LORD CANNING

1856

Lord Canning's Journey to India—Sir Henry Pottinger in Malta—Said Pasha in Egypt—Letter from Lord Dalhousie—Lord Canning arrives in India—Indian Finance—Arrogance of English Officers—Indian Education—Persia and Afghanistan—Lord Granville's Leadership in the House of

PAGE

Lords—The Question of Life Peerages—Lord Granville's Speeches on the Question—Withdrawal of the Government Proposals—Subsequent Attempts to deal with the Question—The Prince Consort—Letters to Lord Canning—Negotiations for Peace with Russia—Opening of Parliament—Letters to Lord Canning—Politics and Society in 1856—Peace Proclaimed—Lord Wodehouse appointed Ambassador to Russia . 148–180

CHAPTER VIII

ST. PETERSBURG AND MOSCOW

1856

Lord Granville accepts a Special Mission to Russia for the Coronation of the Czar—Arrival in St. Petersburg—Interview with Prince Gortchakoff—Princesse Kotchubey—Reception of the Embassy by the Czar at Peterhof—Conversation with the Emperor—Delicate Character of the Political Situation—Departure for Moscow—The Railway—Lord Wodehouse—Entry of the Czar into Moscow—Grand Parade—Equestrian Feats of Lord Cavendish—Ambassadorial Reception—Visit to the Empress-Mother—Festivities and Receptions—The Grande Duchesse Hélène—The Coronation—The Corps Diplomatique present their Congratulations—Sharp Passage between the Czar and Lord Granville—Lord Granville asks for Explanations from Prince Gortchakoff—Lord and Lady Granville's Dinners and Receptions—Military Manœuvres and Reviews—M. de Morny—The Great National Féte—Parting Interview with the Czar—Views on the State of Russia 181–217

CHAPTER IX

THE CHINA WAR

1856–1857

Visit to Herrnsheim—Interview in Paris with the Princesse de Lieven—Return to England—Death of Lord Hardinge—Anecdotes—Discussions in Cabinet about Persia—Society—Appointments to Bishoprics—Lord Granville appointed Chancellor of the University of London—Washington Legation offered to Mr. Villiers—Lord Elgin—Persian Question—Neufchâtel Question—Rumours of the Embassy to France being offered to Lord Granville—Education of the Prince of Wales—Visit to Bowood—Violent Speech of Sir Robert Peel—The 'Farm'—Parliamentary Crisis—The Question of the Lorcha Arrow—Government defeated in the House of Commons—They dissolve—Victory of Lord Palmerston—The Elections—The Question of the Principalities—Lord Granville's Visit to Paris—Dinner at the Tuileries—Mr. Home and Table-turning—The Matrimonial Causes Bill—Lord Granville saves the Bill by good Parliamentary Generalship—Lord Redesdale—Contrast be-

PAGE

tween Lord Derby and Lord Granville—Position of Lord Granville as Leader—His Gifts as a Speaker—Prosper Mérimée on Anecdotes—Observations of Lord Granville on the same subject . . . 218–243

CHAPTER X

THE INDIAN MUTINY

APRIL 9, 1857, TO MARCH 1858

Mutiny at Barrackpore—Lord Canning's Apprehensions—Lieutenant-Colonel Wheeler—The Mutiny spreads—Description of the Situation by Lord Canning—Lord Ellenborough and Mr. Vernon Smith—Question of Pardon to the Mutineers—Action of Mr. Colvin—The Press—Politics in England—Death of General Anson—Sir Colin Campbell succeeds him—Massacre at Cawnpore—Death of Sir Henry Lawrence and Sir Henry Barnard—The Missionary Subscriptions—Diversion of the China Expedition—Lord Elgin—Parliamentary Debates—Criticisms by Lord Ellenborough—Lord Granville at Balmoral—Transfer of India from the Company to the Crown—Fall of Delhi—The Clemency Proclamation—Outcry in London—Attacks on Lord Canning—Lord Granville's Speech at the Mansion House—Lord Palmerston and Mr. Vernon Smith—Critical Condition of Things in India notwithstanding the Fall of Delhi—Revulsion of Feeling in favour of the Governor-General—Renewed Debates—Letters from Lady Canning—Jung Bahadoor—Question of Punishment of Mutineers—Addresses to Lord Canning from Native Rajahs and Zemindars—Letters from Lord Canning on his Policy of Clemency—Resentment at Statements as to Differences between him and Sir Colin Campbell—The coming India Bill—Renewed Expression of Lord Canning's Determination to pursue a Policy of Clemency—Foolish Language of English Officers—Political Danger of this language—Victorious Advance of Sir Colin Campbell—Relief and subsequent Abandonment of Lucknow—Mr. Vernon Smith and the Cabinet—The Government said to be shaky—Lord Ellenborough and Lord Shaftesbury—Vote of Thanks to Lord Canning in Parliament—Public Opinion does Justice to his Policy 244–290

CHAPTER XI

LORD CANNING AND LORD ELLENBOROUGH

1858

Sir Colin Campbell's Tribute to Lord Canning—His Description of Lord Granville's Defence of the Governor-General—Fall of Lord Palmerston's Government—The 'Conspiracy to Murder' Bill—Coalition against Lord Palmerston—Lord Derby forms a Government—Fall of Lucknow—Lord Ellenborough, President of the Board of Control—Position of Lord

PAGE

Canning—He determines not to Resign—The Oude Proclamation—Diminution of Lord Palmerston's Popularity in the House of Commons—Lord Clarendon and Lord John Russell—The second India Bill—Lord John Russell suggests Resolutions—The third India Bill—Lord Ellenborough's Censure of the Oude Proclamation—Difference of Opinion between Lord Canning and Sir James Outram—Resignation of Lord Ellenborough—Mr. Cardwell's Motion—Collapse of the Attack on the Government—The third 'India Bill' becomes Law—Lord Stanley succeeds Lord Ellenborough, and becomes Secretary of State for India—Position of Lord Palmerston, Lord John Russell, and Lord Clarendon—Lord Canning's own Account of his course of action on receiving Lord Ellenborough's Despatch—Proclamation in India of the Assumption of direct Government by the Crown—Unsatisfactory Letter of Lord Stanley to Lord Canning—Attack on Lord Stanley—Lord Canning created an Earl 291–319

CHAPTER XII

LORD GRANVILLE'S ATTEMPT TO FORM AN ADMINISTRATION

1859

Letter from Lord Granville to Mrs. Grote—Prospects of a Liberal Government—Correspondence between Lord Granville and Lord John Russell—Lady Canning and Lord Malmesbury on the Comet—Lord Granville visits Italy—His Description of Political Parties—Efforts to reunite the Liberal Party—Visit of Lord John Russell to Wilton—The Conservative Government defeated on their Reform Bill—Dissolution of Parliament—Correspondence between Lord Granville, Lord Palmerston, and Lord John Russell—The Meeting at Willis's Rooms—Resignation of the Government—The Queen sends for Lord Granville—Further Correspondence with Lord Palmerston and Lord John Russell—Different points of view as to Italian Policy—Views of Lord Clarendon—Lord Granville abandons the attempt to form an Administration—Explanations in Parliament of his communications with the Queen—Description of the new Ministry formed by Lord Palmerston—Lord Granville returns to the Council Office—Letters to Lord Canning 320–346

CHAPTER XIII

ITALY

1859–1860

The Italian War—Lord Granville and the Austrian Ambassador—The Preliminaries of Villafranca—The Emperor of the French and the Conference at Zürich—Confidential Communications between the Queen

PAGE

and Lord Granville—Desire of Lord Palmerston and Lord John Russell to take an active part in the Negotiations resisted by the rest of the Cabinet with the support of the Queen—Lord Russell's Despatch of July 25, 1859—Crisis in the Cabinet—Lord John Russell's August Despatches—Crisis renewed—Lord Granville's Account of the Crisis—Visit to Aldenham—Interview between Lord Cowley and M. Walewski—Letter of Lord Palmerston to the French Ambassador in London—Lord Clarendon's Comments on the Situation—Close Union between Lord Palmerston and Lord John Russell backed by Mr. Gladstone on the Italian Question—Illness of Lady Granville—Her apparent Recovery—Return to England—Renewal of the Crisis in the Cabinet after the Treaty of Zürich—Lord Palmerston and Lord John Russell ready to furnish Armed Assistance to France in resisting Austrian Intervention in Italy—Refusal of the rest of the Cabinet supported by the Queen—Change of Ministry in France—The Situation in London affected thereby—Lord John Russell's Despatch of January 17, 1860—Death of Lady Granville—Correspondence with Lord Canning—Letter of Lord John Russell—The Antidote to Grief 347–373

CHAPTER XIV

THE DEATH OF LORD AND LADY CANNING

1860–1862

The Paper Duties—Differences of Opinion between Lord Palmerston and Mr. Gladstone—Scheme of Fortifications—Mr. Wilson and Sir Charles Trevelyan—Lord Canning discusses with Lord Granville the Question of the Length of Tenure of the Governor-General's Office—The Reorganisation of the Governor-General's Council—Unjust Attacks on Lord Clyde—The Bill for the Repeal of the Paper Duties carried—Skilful conduct of the Measure in the House of Lords by Lord Granville—Indian Taxation—Mr. Wilson and Mr. Bartle Frere—Opposite Views of Sir Henry Lawrence and Sir John Lawrence on the Reliance to be placed on the Native Princes in the Administration of India—Lord Canning's Sympathy with the former—Death of Sir Henry Ward and of Mr. Wilson—English Politics—Lord Granville's Journey to Spain—Another Great Exhibition projected—Illness of Mr. Sidney Herbert—He is created a Peer—The Cawnpore Monument—Question of Lord Canning's Successor—Sir John Lawrence and Lord Elgin—The Ministry reconstituted—Death of Lord Herbert of Lea—Lord John Russell goes to the Upper House—Affair of the Trent—Death of the Prince Consort—A Time of 'extraordinary desolation'—Return of Lord Canning from India—His Death—Sketch of Lord Canning by Lord Granville—Death of the Dowager Lady Granville—Letter from Lord Canning to Sir Charles Wood on his Tenure of Office as Governor-General of India 374–413

CHAPTER XV

LORD GRANVILLE AS MINISTER OF EDUCATION

1859–1864

PAGE

Lord Granville and Mr. Lowe—The Duties of the Council Office—The Board of Health—Lord Granville and Education—Mr. Gladstone's Views on Education—Kneller Hall—The Prince Consort and the Teaching of Science and Art—The Factory Acts—Abortive Attempts to deal with Education under the Ministries of Lord Aberdeen and Lord Palmerston—Lord John Russell takes up the Question as an independent Member—Correspondence between him and Lord Granville—Lord Palmerston's second Government tries to deal with the Question—The Newcastle Commission—Plans of the Government—Proposals made by Mr. Lowe—Examination *versus* Inspection—The Revised Code—Strong Opposition of the Clergy of the Church of England—The Conscience Clause—The Inspectors' Reports—Successful Attack on Mr. Lowe in the House of Commons—Lord Granville and Mr. Lowe both resign—At Lord Palmerston's request Lord Granville withdraws his Resignation—His Letter to Mr. Lowe—The Question of Secondary Education—A Commission appointed—'What Great Men have said of Great Men'—Lord Granville and Education in Staffordshire—His Position as Chancellor of the University of London—His Speech on 'Blue Stockings'—His Reputation as an after-dinner Speaker—His Opinion on the Teaching of Modern Languages . 414-439

CHAPTER XVI

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

1862–1864

The French Expedition to Mexico—Question of Mediation in the American Civil War—Letter to Lord Russell—The Polish Question—Correspondence with Sir Charles Grey—The Schleswig-Holstein Question—The Condition of Germany—Lord Granville with the Queen in Germany—Interview with Count Bismarck—Warlike Declarations of Lord Palmerston—Lord Russell's Despatches—Ignorance of English Opinion about Germany—War in the Duchies—Lord Palmerston and Lord Russell disposed to intervene—Opposition on the part of the Queen—Correspondence with Lord Granville—The Treaty of 1852—Lord Clarendon joins the Government—Threats addressed to Count Apponyi by Lord Palmerston as to the Austrian Fleet passing up the Channel—Controversy between Lord Granville and Lord Russell—Attacks on the Queen—Lord Ellenborough and the Queen—The Armistice and the London Conference—Obstinacy of Denmark—Failure of the Negotiations—Renewed Controversy between Lord Granville and

PAGE

Lord Russell—Further Correspondence with the Queen—Treaty of Prague—Seizure of the Duchies by Austria and Prussia—The Duke of Augustenburg pushed aside—Disappointment of the Queen . . 440–477

CHAPTER XVII

THE DEATH OF LORD PALMERSTON

1865

Lord Westbury becomes Chancellor—His Letter to Lord Granville—His Judgments in Ecclesiastical Cases—The Edmunds Case and the Registrarship of the Leeds Bankruptcy Court—The Position of the Chancellor threatened—Correspondence with Lord Granville—Lord Westbury resigns—Numerous Losses experienced by the Ministry of Lord Palmerston—Death of Lord Lyndhurst—Death of Lord Palmerston—Letters from Lord Russell and Lord Clarendon—Lord Russell becomes Prime Minister and Lord Clarendon Foreign Secretary—He appoints Lord Granville Lord Warden of the Cinque Ports—Golder's Green and Walmer Castle—Lord Granville's pursuit of a Country Estate—Improvements at Walmer—Death of Mrs. Arbuthnot—Letter of Mr. Gladstone—Discussion of the principal Features of the Political Period between 1855 and 1865 478–496

CHAPTER XVIII

THE LEADERSHIP OF EARL RUSSELL

1865–1867

Lord Russell and the Extension of the Franchise—Vacancies in the Government—Mr. Lowe and Mr. Stansfeld—Correspondence between Lord Granville, Lord Russell, and Mr. Gladstone—Lord Russell appoints Mr. Goschen Chancellor of the Duchy—A Franchise Bill introduced—Lord Granville's Views on the Extension of the Franchise—Secession of many of the leading Whig Peers—An immediate Dissolution discussed—Critical Condition of Foreign Affairs—Attacks of the *Times* on Lord Russell—Proposal to introduce a Redistribution Bill—The Franchise Bill carried on the Second Reading—Defeat of the Government on Lord Dunkellin's Amendment in Committee—Resignation of the Government—Lord Derby, Prime Minister—'Dishing the Whigs'—Violent Scene in the House of Lords during the Discussion of the Boundary Bill—Comparison with similar scene in 1782—Disaffection in Ireland—Letter of Lord Kimberley—The Education Question—Lord Russell's Resolutions—His Education Dinner in Chesham Place—Lord Russell's Speech in the House of Lords—His Illness and Retirement—Correspondence with Lord Granville—Lord Clarendon on the Situation—Lord Derby retires—Mr. Disraeli, Prime Minister—His approaches to Lord Granville as a possible Colleague 497–520

CHAPTER XIX

MR. GLADSTONE'S FIRST ADMINISTRATION

1868

PAGE

Mr. Gladstone's Resolutions on the Irish Church Question—Lord Granville submits his Views to the Queen on some Constitutional Points—The Suspensory Bill—Lord Granville's Speech in introducing the Measure in the House of Lords—Lord Russell expresses himself in favour of Concurrent Endowment—Correspondence between him and Lord Granville—Ambiguity as to Lord Russell's Intentions—His Parliamentary Dinner—Correspondence with Mr. Gladstone and Lord Granville—The 'Chapter of Autobiography'—Mr. Gladstone's Defeat in Lancashire—Final Retirement of Lord Russell—Resignation of Mr. Disraeli—Mr. Gladstone, Prime Minister—The new Administration—Mr. Bright and Mr. Villiers—Mr. Bright's Visit to Osborne—Proposed Offer of Viceroyalty of India to Lord Salisbury—Position of the Liberal Government—Letter from Lord Shaftesbury—Lord Clarendon, Foreign Minister—Lord Granville on the Position of the Emperor Napoleon—Lord Clarendon's Conversation with the King of Prussia—Count Bismarck—A Temporary Calm 521–543

ILLUSTRATIONS

TO

THE FIRST VOLUME.

PHOTOGRAVURE PLATES.

PORTRAIT OF LORD GRANVILLE (1867) . . . . *Frontispiece*
From a photograph by Messrs. W. & D. Downey, 57 Ebury Street, London.

LORD GRANVILLE LEVESON-GOWER: FIRST EARL GRANVILLE . . . . . *To face page* 26
From full-length portrait by Sir Thomas Lawrence at Kensington Palace.

LORD GRANVILLE PRESENTING M. THIERS AND THE DUKE OF WELLINGTON TO EACH OTHER AT 16 BRUTON STREET (1848) . . . . . ,, 10
Pen and ink sketch by Richard Doyle.

THE HON. GRANVILLE GEORGE LEVESON-GOWER (1826) ,, 14
From an engraving of a miniature.

CHARLES JOHN, EARL CANNING, K.G. . . . . ,, 125
From drawing in chalks by George Richmond, R.A.

LIFE

OF

THE SECOND EARL GRANVILLE

CHAPTER I

EARLY LIFE

1815–1837

WHEN in December 1783 the younger Pitt, dismayed by the refusal of Lord Temple to accept the seals of Secretary of State, was hesitating whether he would persevere in the uphill task of forming a Ministry, he turned for assistance at that critical moment in his career to a retired statesman who occupied an exceptional position in the hierarchy of the great Whig houses. Granville, second Lord Gower, had in 1779 resigned the Presidency of the Council in the Administration of Lord North, because—so he publicly stated—'he had seen such things pass of late, that no man of honour or conscience could any longer sit there.'[1] From the independent position thus acquired he announced that he had abandoned the opinion, with which as a Minister he had got connected, that it was necessary to reduce the American colonies by force; and when, within a short but memorable period of only twelve months, Lord North had fallen, Lord Rockingham had died, and Lord Shelburne had resigned, the settlement of the political situation seemed to be in the hollow of his hand, if he so willed it to be. But he declined either to form or even to join in forming an Administration. Fortune is said

[1] *Parliamentary History*, xx. 1175, 1176.

to refuse to offer over again, even to her favourites, the gifts which they have once deliberately refused. But Fortune made an exception in favour of Lord Gower, and before the year 1783 was out, the future of the country was again depending on his nod. His answer to Pitt in December, given as it was in the affirmative, and followed by his own return to the Presidency of the Council, carried the new Prime Minister over his initial difficulties, and converted a venture which at first had seemed nothing but a scratch combination made by an ambitious and insolent youth, into one of the strongest Ministries of modern times. Lord Gower was then in his sixty-second year. Already in 1763 the keen eye of the elder Fox had descried him as one marked out to play the part of the honest broker between divergent opinions, as a person of a humour and nature most practicable, and perhaps the only man left in the country who could be Southern Secretary 'without either quarrelling with Charles Townshend, or letting down the dignity of his own office.'[1] His subsequent career had not belied Henry Fox's early estimate. Considerable acquired information, joined to a high order of natural ability, gained Lord Gower the respect of his contemporaries. A princely fortune, administered with prudence, placed him beyond the temptations caused by the financial necessities which had marred the career and injured the reputation of more than one of the statesmen of the time. If not an orator, he was able to explain his views with clearness, and in 1783 he stepped forward in the character originally marked out for him by Henry Fox, to be the conciliator of rival energies and the provider of political ballast to the ship of State. The Administration formed with his assistance by Pitt survived all the attacks of the Whigs and the storms of the French Revolution, and he remained a member of it himself during the earlier and more liberal period of their rule; retiring in 1794 when the Portland Whigs joined Pitt. Nor did he again hold office, though he allowed his eldest son, who had been Ambassador in Paris from 1790 to 1793, to take office

[1] *Life of Shelburne*, i. 187, 188.

as Postmaster-General in 1799. In 1786 he was created Marquis of Stafford. He died in 1803 at the age of eighty-three, in the brief interval between the first and the second Administration of Mr. Pitt.

Lord Gower had been married three times. His first wife, the daughter of Mr. Nicholas Fazakerly, of Prescot in Lancashire, fell a victim to smallpox in 1745. Her only child predeceased her. In 1748 he married again, and from Lady Louisa Egerton, his second wife—the daughter of the Earl of Bridgewater, the early patron of canal navigation—are descended the Leveson-Gowers, Dukes of Sutherland. She died in 1761; and in 1768 Lord Gower married Lady Susanna Stewart, daughter of the sixth Earl of Galloway. The only son of this marriage, Granville Leveson-Gower, was born in 1773. To him the happy temperament of his father descended, and aided by his own good qualities he saw the path of public ambition early and easily opened to him; for Pitt had not forgotten his obligations to Lord Gower. Elected member for Staffordshire at twenty-two years of age, Granville Leveson-Gower obtained an early insight into the world of Parliament; and under the auspices of Lord Malmesbury, whom he accompanied to Paris and afterwards to Lille in 1797, found himself a diplomatist as well as a politician before he was thirty years of age. The stormy month of August 1804 saw him appointed Ambassador to St. Petersburg, when England was forming the third Coalition against Napoleon.[1] Accompanying the Emperor of Russia in the following year to the seat of war, he became involved in the headlong flight from Brunn after the battle of Austerlitz, and with other distinguished persons narrowly escaped capture. At the Russian Court he remained with a brief interval till 1807,

[1] The first despatch to Lord Granville Leveson-Gower on his appointment as Ambassador to St. Petersburg was dated October 10, 1804, and the first despatch to Viscount Granville on being appointed Ambassador to the Hague (forwarding credentials and instructions) was dated February 21, 1824; but on November 14 preceding a notice was inserted in the *London Gazette* stating that the King had been pleased to appoint the Right Hon. Viscount Granville to be his Majesty's Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to his Majesty the King of the Netherlands.

when after the Treaty of Tilsit the Emperor became the ally of Napoleon and broke off relations with England. He is said to have left St. Petersburg in haste and without taking formal leave, so strained had the relations between the two countries become.

At St. Petersburg the Ambassador by some imputed ill treatment or neglect incurred the ill will of a Mr. Bellingham. The circumstances preyed on a morbid temperament, and Mr. Bellingham continued to harbour ideas of revenge. When Mr. Perceval was shot in the lobby of the House of Commons on May 11, 1812, it appeared from the assassin's confession that the bullet had been intended for Lord Granville Leveson-Gower. In 1815 the ex-Ambassador was raised to the House of Peers by the title of Viscount Granville, and continued to reside in England with little interruption, taking occasional part in the debates of the Upper House.

In 1822 Mr. Canning, with whom Lord Granville was connected by a close personal friendship as well as by political agreement, became Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs. A new spirit was at once felt to be inspiring the policy of England abroad; and Lord Granville, having now to make a final option between a career at home and diplomacy, decided in favour of the latter. In 1823 he accepted the post of Minister to the Hague with the rank of Ambassador, and except at brief intervals became a stranger to his own country.[1] But his residence at the Hague was short, as in 1824 he succeeded Sir Charles Stewart as Ambassador to the Court of France. His liberal opinions, unlike those of many of the diplomatists of the time, were not weakened, but if anything accentuated, by residence amid the prejudices of circles where Metternich was still worshipped as a god, and Polignac was regarded as a possible minister. He consequently found himself after a time outrunning the ideas which even so fair-minded a chief as Lord Aberdeen deemed it desirable for an ambassador to hold, and he was recalled when Lord Dudley, Mr. Huskisson, and Lord Palmerston left the Cabinet of the Duke of Wellington in 1828. But it was only in order

[1] *London Gazette*, February 21, 1824.

to be quickly reinstated in 1830 by Lord Grey; and to the indignation of the Legitimist party in France, which had just fallen from power, he made a special journey from Paris to London in order to vote for the Reform Bill, and to their astonishment returned alive to glory in having done so. He was raised to an earldom in 1833.

Lord Granville had in 1809 married Lady Harriet Cavendish, second daughter of William, Duke of Devonshire, and of his first wife, Lady Georgiana Spencer, known as 'the beautiful Duchess.' The eldest son of this marriage, Granville George Leveson-Gower, the subject of this book, was born in the year of Waterloo, and at the time when his father became Minister at the Hague was eight years of age. The second son, William, died early in life in 1833.[1] The third son, Frederick Leveson-Gower, will be frequently mentioned in these pages.

'The boys are arrived after a most terrible passage [Lady Granville wrote to her sister Lady Carlisle from the Hague in 1823], three nights tossing about and terribly sick; yet I never saw them look so prosperous, and it is such a delight to hear their little voices again. They are now in my room playing at being Dutch housemaids.'[2]

In Paris, one of the Dutch housemaids had developed into a miniature diplomatist. 'I took the little governor on Friday to a child's ball at Mrs. Morier's,' his mother relates; 'he was delicious, danced like a little Frenchman, and behaved like a little ambassador.'[3]

'You have no idea of the happiness [she continues in the same strain] of adorable little Granville here. He has got a pony; he is learning to swim at the École de Natation; we have junkets at the Bois de Boulogne: the four children on donkeys and I in a curricle: Abercromby and Granville on horseback.'[4]

We are not obliged to rely entirely on Lady Granville's letters for an account of those early years, as her son late in his own life noted down some reminiscences of them.

[1] See *Life of Lady Georgiana Fullerton*, by Mrs. Augustus Craven, p. 93.
[2] *Letters of Harriet, Countess Granville*, i. 280. *Ibid.* i. 334.
[4] *Ibid.* i. 350.

'The first thing I clearly remember of these boyish days [he writes] happened eight days before my fourth birthday, the day on which my brother Frederick was born. The nursery was above my mother's bedroom. My father had desired my nurse to keep us quiet. I was naughty, and the nurse could not control me. My father came up exceedingly angry and scolded her, a thing he was never known to do. I was awestruck and miserable at the injustice to my nurse, and at my want of courage to interfere, and to explain that it was not her fault.

'From four to eight years old, we went regularly to Wherstead, near Ipswich.[1] My recollection of it is generally confused, with a few persons and events coming very clearly cut: the persons being "Mad Jack," a harmless lunatic whom we met in our walks, and were apt to meet again in our dreams, and the old coachman, Parker, who got into sad disgrace afterwards, when partly by his mismanagement seven horses, going over to the Hague, kicked each other to death. But the principal object of our admiration was a tall keeper, Turnour, brother to one who was much later head keeper at Windsor, and whose impudence was afterwards a source of constant delight to Prince Albert, who, indeed, seemed to lose all pleasure in covert shooting after Turnour's departure. The latter used to indulge in many expletives, ending always with the apology, "I beg your Royal Highness's pardon, but they did not mind swearing in my last place" (the late Lord Lichfield's).

'When the Prince complained that he was getting no shots: "Well, your Royal Highness, I can't make the pheasants fly the way they don't like, but I am sure you're getting an *abundacion* of shots."

'And when Sidney Herbert complimented him on the good sport they had had: "Yes, but we should have done better if it had not been for the d——d farmer."

'As they drove off, the Prince asked Herbert whether he knew who was the d——d farmer: "*It is I.*"

'I remember Edward Montagu, Frederick Byng, and Charles Standish, calling to the nursery window as they came home from shooting, the last giving me a blackbird he had just killed; and much annoyed by Edward Montagu telling him that he was a failure, too heavy for a Frenchman and much too frivolous for an Englishman.

'I do not know how far this opinion was justified by my seeing him many years later at Mouchy, then belonging to the very clever

[1] Lord Granville had lived at Tixall in Staffordshire before that time. See the *Life of Lady Georgiana Fullerton*, ch. i.

Vicomtesse Alfred de Noailles. He danced a hornpipe for the edification of the French ladies, but was so hot as to be obliged at once to change all his clothes. He came back, and leaning over the shoulders of Mdlle. Cécile de Noailles, afterwards Duchesse de Mouchy, the Vicomtesse exclaimed, "M. Standish était autrefois mon contemporain. A présent c'est le contemporain de mes enfants."

'He had a habit of saying after each sentence, "Just so, just so." Being told by his confessor that if he did not reform he would be eternally d——d, he answered, "Eternally d——d, just so, just so." He was a good-natured man, and a cheery member of society.

'Mr. Standish's son, Lionel, married Sabine de Noailles, a charming woman, of whom I may afterwards say something.[1]

'To come back to Wherstead and the events that made the greatest impression upon me. The first was when Mr. Sneyd gave up shooting for ever, because he had overheard my father whisper to Turnour, "Ask the gentlemen to kill no more hens, but you need not mention it to Mr. Sneyd."[2] The second a much more serious event. Our pretty nurserymaid burst into the nursery, "The Duke of Wellington has shot Lord Granville." It was true, and after the Duke had shot two dogs, my father received the full charge at a short distance in his face, one shot passing through his nose without touching the eye. Some were extracted, but many remained in his body during his life.

'The Duke acted in a charade the part of a nurse, with the very great lady, Princess Lieven, in his lap.

'Mr. Luttrell[3] was a frequent guest. He complained of the fire because it attracted and did not repel, as one in a good fireplace ought to do. He complained also of the cream having a flavour of turnips. My mother gave orders as to the feeding of the cows, and watched with interest Mr. Luttrell taking his first taste of it. "Well, Mr. Luttrell, how is it?" "Excellent, dear Lady Granville, with boiled mutton."

'Mr. Luttrell was a charming companion, very witty and original; his conversation much superior to his writing. Testy and sensitive, he had an odd notion that all servants were in league against him, and that they intentionally brought him the wrong *entrée* at dinner.

'When a groom of the chambers at a rout repeated the inquiry for

[1] Mdlle. Cécile de Noailles married the Duc de Mouchy; Mdlle. Sabine de Noailles married Mr. Standish.

[2] Mr. Ralph Sneyd, the owner of Keele Hall in Staffordshire.

[3] Henry Luttrell, 'the last of the conversationists.' Gronow, *Reminiscences*, ii. 255.

his name: "Sir, I give you my honour that I am invited. If I am not, you will have the pleasure of seeing me kicked downstairs."

'He and Samuel Rogers often said disagreeable things of one another, but they lived much together. Luttrell said he did so because it prevented the other during the time saying ill-natured words about him.

'When Miss O'Neill, the celebrated actress, came to Saltram,[1] after acting at Plymouth, Luttrell among others complimented her. She, not knowing who he was, and not being impressed with his looks, turned away. He immediately confided to my mother, "I have seen fifty such girls in a cart in Kilkenny."

'My mother took us to Felixstowe, where I saw the sea for the first time. She had previously taken Ada Byron—they were curious to know what impression the ocean would make upon the poet's sole daughter. She remarked, "I do not like it; it is so like my governess," which hardly fulfilled their expectations.

'About this time I went to a child's ball at Carlton House. I disliked it much, and was not consoled by George the Fourth being good-natured.

'As I have mentioned the Duke of Wellington in connection with Wherstead, I may jot down some anecdotes respecting him. They are of course old, but some may not be generally known. The activity of the Duke was wonderful. No idle young man was so exact in the discharge of all social duties. He was not only hospitable himself, but he went constantly into general society, attended public concerts, and was seen at marriages. His well-known coachman assumed the right, never disputed, of waiting with the Duke's carriage next door to the house which he was visiting. He also paid constant afternoon visits. M. Guizot in his *Memoirs* mentions as a thing creditable to the British public, how completely they ignored a little ridicule attaching to certain flirtations which were hardly consistent with his age and character. The respect for his great qualities in public and in private was universal. His power in the House of Lords was extraordinary, the deference paid to him in society unlimited. In the streets everybody touched their hats to him as he passed. He was courteous in manner and good-natured, especially to young persons and children, but never affected any sentiment or any modesty. Telling Lady Wilton, for whom he had a great regard and esteem, of a recent political event, he said, "That is the case, ma'am, according to my understanding; and let me tell you (slapping his knee), no one ever had a better."

'When his brother Lord Cowley, died, a lady friend sent an

[1] The country seat of the Earl of Morley.

anxious inquiry after the Duke's health. "There must be some mistake; tell her that it is Lord Cowley who is dead. I am very well." There was a delay of an hour at Lord Wellesley's funeral. He complained that it was very inconvenient. "One might have done something else."

'His military punctuality was great. His arriving to the minute at Cabinets shamed his colleagues into being punctual.

'He had generally an answer for any criticism. When Lady Westmorland lamented to him the smell of kitchen (which there used to be) at Walmer, he answered, "Oh, I rather like it."

'Lord Ellenborough on his return from India told Sir R. Peel at Windsor some extraordinary stories of sunstroke. Sir Robert looked incredulous. The ex-Governor-General appealed to the Duke. "All I can say is, that in some parts of India it is sometimes very hot."

'When his son complained that he was the only officer of the Rifles, quartered at Dover, who had not been asked to dine at Walmer, he answered, "F.M. the Duke of Wellington begs to inform Captain the Marquis of Douro, that he is the only officer of the Rifles who has not called at Walmer Castle."

'He had great confidence in the capacity of an old soldier to turn his hand to anything. Mr. Arbuthnot informed Lord Clanwilliam that he had taken as gardener a colour-sergeant of the Coldstreams. Lord Clanwilliam said he supposed he knew something of gardening. "Oh, yes, he robbed several orchards in France."

'He was very fond of Walmer. He had been quartered there as an ensign, living in a house now called Wellesley House, on Castle Hill.

'He received much at the Castle. In those days guests arrived in carriages, which were housed in the entrance hall. As the Duchess of Cambridge reminded me, when talking of Walmer, he lent the Castle to the Queen and Prince Albert, and had an open passage glazed for their convenience. The society of Lord Clanwilliam, Captain of Deal Castle, and his charming wife, was a great resource to him. He also saw much of Lord Mahon, whose lately published reminiscences of conversations with the Duke give many anecdotes which I had heard from Lord Clanwilliam.

'The Duke of Wellington walked every morning on the Batteries, and went on hunting with the harriers, almost to his death. The old yeoman, master of the pack, told me that it was painful to see the Duke's jaw, from weakness, rising and falling with the canter of Copenhagen.

'He was proud of his French, which was not very good, and peculiarly pronounced. Very civil to foreigners. Richard Doyle

gave me a charming little sketch of the Duke shaking hands with M. Thiers, whom I introduced to him in Bruton Street in 1848.

'Count Orloff, the intimate friend of the Emperor Nicholas, was famous for his strength. Among other proofs of it, he could roll up a silver plate. I asked him once whether he retained the power. He said that the last time he had tried was at a dinner at Apsley House. He succeeded, though the plate was stronger and heavier than usual. Everybody expressed admiration, but the Count overheard the Duke's whisper, "Yes, but I should like to see the fellow unroll it." He was quite right; the thing was done, but at the expense of the skin of the Russian's hands.

'His deafness caused him to speak much louder than he was aware of. The House of Lords was sometimes startled by what was meant for a whisper.

'Lord John Russell was once rather embarrassed at a Trinity House dinner. He was close to Mr. Melville, the chaplain, a very eloquent and ornate preacher. The Duke appealed to Lord John, saying, "A good sermon this afternoon; I told him what to say."

'Towards the end of his life he became sometimes irritable. Lord William Lennox, a former aide-de-camp, moved in the House of Commons for some Horse Guards papers. The Ministry consented, but when the order came to the Duke, he used very strong language, and absolutely refused to give them up. I forget how it ended.

'There were days when Lord Fitzroy Somerset and Mr. Algernon Greville did not like to ask him questions on business. Lady Douro used to go to the Duke, and immediately brought them all that they wanted. He was always charming in his manner to her. A hint from her, which hardly ever came, that she would like a present of some value, acted at once like oil on the waters.

'I doubt whether I ever saw George IV. again until as an Eton boy I was commanded, with Spencer Cowper, to meet our respective parents, who were staying at Windsor Castle for Ascot races. We saw the King's three horses run first, second, and third for the Ascot Cup. I believe the best did not win. Cowper and I were much disappointed at not creating a sensation among the Etonians by our returning in a royal pony carriage. We were three minutes after lock-up.

'I remember that, like what some one said of Naples, I was always glad to come to Wherstead, and equally so to leave it, liking the change between the London and country bread and butter.

'It was about this time that my political feelings were first aroused. My nurse was violently for Queen Caroline; the governess furiously against her. I sided with the former. We cheered the Queen in



LORD GRANVILLE PRESENTING M. THIERS AND THE DUKE OF WELLINGTON TO EACH OTHER AT 16 BRUTON STREET.

Pen-and-ink Sketch by RICHARD DOYLE.

South Audley Street, and when the governess taught me to sing "God save the King," I must have been the first to translate "King" into "Queen."

'I have only a slight recollection of the Hague, where my father was sent Ambassador in 1823 by Mr. Canning. I am not, however, aware that he ever got, like his predecessor, Sir Charles Bagot, any politico-commercial poems, such as :

> In matters of commerce, the fault of the Dutch
> Is giving too little, and asking too much, &c.

'I had a charming present of a goat carriage. My mother gave herself a lovely pink pigeon, which unfortunately turned white after its first bath. . . .

'It is not usual, so says La Rochefoucauld, for people to complain of their judgment or tact. They all with few exceptions do so of their memories.

'It is not to follow the fashion, but from conviction, that I say with great regret that my power of memory was originally bad, and has never been properly exercised. I not only forget the details of my parliamentary and official actions, but also the events in private life, which would naturally excite my interest. I can give three instances of this forgetfulness. I found in a drawer a requisition to stand for a county, a flattering thing for a young man. I concluded it was addressed to my father, but on examining the date, and observing that it was addressed to Lord Leveson, and not to Lord Granville Leveson-Gower, I had to admit that it had been sent to myself.

'I have not the slightest recollection of a journey on horseback through France with my father and eldest sister, which is described by my dear sister Georgiana Fullerton,[1] though I remember as if it was yesterday a ride in the same year at Brighton.

'The late Duke of Hamilton once referred to the time when he and I used to take lessons in circus riding. I entirely denied the fact of my ever having taken such lessons; the altercation became warm, until upon his asking me whether I could contradict him that, owing to a particular configuration of my person, I could never clear the seventh horse, jumping from a springboard, I at once remembered that for a whole summer the Duke and I had taken lessons from the famous clowns, the Auriols, in the great circus of the Champs Élysées.

'What I remember well are statements in debate, all that has passed in a recent conversation, and anecdotes. The latter I do

[1] Lady Georgiana Leveson-Gower married Mr. Fullerton, July 13, 1833. See the *Life of Lady Georgiana Fullerton*, by Mrs. Augustus Craven, p. 95.

not easily forget, and like children I resent any variation in them when told by others.

'The late Lord Carlisle once said that he remembered being christened, upon which Lord Melbourne said that he did not think much of that, as he remembered being born.

'At eight years old I was sent to a private school kept by Mr. Bradford at Beaconsfield, where I remained five years; a very bad school, and I remember no merit in the master; but it was very fashionable, and called at the time, as others have been since, the little House of Lords. A Queen Anne house, with a charming garden, and a broad gravel walk ended by a haha, which separated it from the pretty park of Hall Barn, which had belonged to Mr. Burke. The village was chiefly a long broad street. We, as well as everyone else, pronounced its name "Beckonsfield." This was many years later a subject of difference between Lord Bradford a former schoolfellow and myself on one side, and Lord Beaconsfield on the other, who pronounced his title phonetically, as the field of the Beacon. He told us one day that he was not going to be dictated to by two aristocratic schoolboys.

'Mrs. Bradford was Irish and a virago, but more so with her husband and servants than with us, whom she fed well—not a usual thing in those days—and whom she nursed, when ill, with absolute devotion.

'The present Duke of Northumberland was at the head of the school, held in much awe by the boys.[1] But he took me under his protection, and inspired a lasting feeling of gratitude, which probably would not have been created at a later date. His fights with his brother Jocelyn Percy used to appear to us like those of the giants of old.

'It was a great mark of favour being called to clean the master's birdcages, and also to be taken occasionally to Hedsor on Sunday, when he was invited to preach there. Excepting on a visit from Eton, I did not see Hedsor again for some forty years. On going to church there from Cliveden, I got puzzled whether I really remembered the inside of the church, or fancied I did, and at last said to myself, "If there is a fireplace round the corner of this pew I am right," and I was right.

'It is curious that a year or two ago Lord Bradford and I counted twenty-five Beaconsfield schoolfellows still alive, while I could only think of three or four Etonians, and no Oxonians, who had been my contemporaries, and were still alive.

[1] Algernon, sixth Duke of Northumberland, sat in the Conservative Cabinet from 1878 to 1880 as Lord Privy Seal.

'I liked most of my schoolfellows much, and do not remember any that I really disliked, though there was a little bullying. But I did not like the school, and out of bore I took to much desultory reading, a habit which Eton cured, and which was only partially restored at a private tutor's.

'We were all a little jealous of Algernon Peyton, son of the clergyman of that name, surnamed the "Sloven," on account of his exceeding neatness. The latter was Rector of Long Stanton, a living worth 14,000*l.* a year. The cause of our envy was that Holmes, the driver of the *Blenheim*, the coach to Oxford, always touched his hat to the nephew of Sir Henry Peyton, famous for his grey team, and equally so for his *quid pro quos*, and his stage-coaching conversation.

'Examining a candidate for the place of footman: "How did you come to town?" "By the *Defiance*, Sir Henry." "Where did you light your lamps?" "At Maidenhead, Sir Henry." "Well, you will do."

'Honouring a lady with a seat on the box for a sixteen-mile drive, his only remark halfway was, "Woolly weather for coach-horses, my lady."

'His health being drunk enthusiastically at an agricultural meeting, he thanked them, and drank their health in return, and sitting down, kicked his neighbour, Lord Jersey: "I did not say too much, did I?"

'Several of Sir Henry's sayings were treasured up by Lord Jersey, a very handsome man, a fine horseman, and good judge of racing. He married Lady Sarah Fane, the daughter of Miss Child, the banker's heiress, who was herself enabled to be married at Gretna Green, by Lord Westmorland shooting one of the leaders of the post-chaise which conveyed the indignant father, who thought he had caught them, but like Lord Ullin "was left lamenting."

'Lady Jersey was beautiful, voluble, and considered first the fashionable leader of the Whigs and then of the Tories. She was called "Honze heures" by Nicholas Pahlen, on account of her peculiar French, "Queen Sarah" by the rest of the world.[1] It was she who, when yawning in the midst of her torrent of talk, put her hand on her friend's mouth to prevent his profiting by the occasion. She received presents from all her friends on her birthday. Lord Alvanley always selected one lying in her anteroom, and presented it to her with a pretty speech. She was very kind to me, as the son of one whom as a girl she had encouraged (how beautiful I should have been had that marriage come off), but indignant, as she might

[1] Lady Sarah Fane, afterwards Lady Jersey, was the daughter of the Earl of Westmorland, who had married Miss Child. As to Count Pahlen, see below, p. 389.

well be, at my being appointed in 1865 to the Lord Wardenship of the Cinque Ports, an office which had been held by the Great Duke of Wellington, an intimate friend of hers.

'Coming back, however, to Beaconsfield, I may mention my brother William joining me there. He had been crippled early in life. One of the most perfect and charming characters I have ever known. When I look back at a long series of faults and follies, almost the brightest spot seems to me to be my devotion to my brother, and the return of affection which he gave me. It is a type of the friendship which exists at the end of our lives between my brother Frederick and myself.

'The Beaconsfield schoolfellow with whom I have up to the present time kept up the most intimate friendship is Lord Bradford, who is younger than I am. Lord Cawdor also was there with me, and a most popular boy, and John Balfour, who afterwards married Lord Cawdor's sister.

'George Morant was singularly clever with his pencil, particularly so in drawing ships. He could give the rigging of a man-of-war, almost without a mistake in a spar or a rope.

'I recollect little else but Schevening with its bathers and fishermen, excepting a Russian lady, Madame de Gournieff, who composed and played beautifully a certain waltz, which still bears her name.

'George Herbert, son of the Dean of Manchester, was a good-looking and naturally clever boy, very popular, as he remained till his death: though so young, a complete man of the world, with some of the defects of that character: he taught us to toss up for sovereigns, and other things which it would have been better for us not to know. He had high spirits. He found a case full of visiting cards in Piccadilly, and saying that it was a pity that they should be wasted, he left one at every house, till there were no more.

'I believe the Duke of Northumberland was my only private schoolfellow who attained high official rank; a great difference with my Oxford contemporaries: Dalhousie, Newcastle, Elgin, Canning, besides future bishops and diplomatists.

'During my stay at Beaconsfield, I frequently went to Paris for my holidays, often in an independent way.'

Life at Beaconsfield did not probably differ materially from the life at most private schools at the commencement of the last century, and on the whole Granville Leveson-Gower was fortunate in his experiences. Lord John Russell used to relate how at a kindred establishment at which he had been placed, having a great dislike to the mutton fat



THE HON. GRANVILLE GEORGE LEVESON-GOWER
1826.

which every boy was ordered to eat with the meat whether he liked it or not, he had succeeded, as he hoped unobserved, in dropping it under the table; but having been discovered was compelled by a clerical pedagogue to sweep it up off the dusty floor of the dining-room and eat it, dirt and all.[1] But even the régime of a private school in the early part of the last century was unable to sour the temper of so easy-going a pupil as Lord Granville's eldest son; and his mother tells her sister that she still 'finds him a delightful little companion; independent, docile, and all full of natural tact and instinctive civility, which prevents his ever being *de trop*.'[2] A transfer to Eton in 1829, however, was no doubt welcome. Talleyrand, then French Ambassador, is said to have had the honours of that famous school done to him about this time by an enthusiastic admirer. At the conclusion of the orthodox round, the cicerone observed: 'Veuillez bien agréer, Monsieur Le Prince, que c'est la plus belle éducation au monde.' 'Certainement,' Talleyrand grimly replied, 'et pourtant c'est détestable.' But even the Eton of Talleyrand's day, at least outside College and the horrors of 'Long Chamber,' was an advance upon Beaconsfield, though in regard to education the great school, notwithstanding the lapse of three centuries and every change in Church and State, still bore the imperishable stamp of the culture of the Renaissance; and it might be said that as long as the majority of the students 'were careful to act in a becoming way in public,' and a minority 'could express themselves in good Latin,' all was well.[3]

At Eton in the summer months boys are devotees either of the cricket field or of the river; in the language of the place they are either 'dry bobs' or 'wet bobs,' with the rare exceptions of those amphibious youths who excel equally on the dry land and on water, and of those unfortunate persons who shine upon neither. Granville Leveson-Gower did not take kindly to cricket. He missed a catch in a Lower boy

[1] See *Contemporary Review* (February 1891), vol. lix. p. 246.
[2] *Letters of Harriet, Countess Granville*, ii. 30.
[3] Dr. Creighton, *Historical Essays and Reviews*, p. 61.

match, and somebody shouted, 'Fumble fingers!'—an observation which persuaded him that the river was a more congenial place than the Shooting Fields. Of his doings at Eton a few glimpses are to be found in the letters which he wrote to his sisters.

GRANVILLE LEVESON-GOWER TO THE HON. GEORGIANA LEVESON-GOWER.[1]

ETON, *Friday*, *May* 22, 1829.

'MY DEAR GEORGY,—I am quite ashamed of myself when I think that I have been nearly three weeks and have not yet written. How much obliged to you I am for your letter and for your kind offer. I should like either very much, but I think I should prefer the candlestick. I hear Georgina Ellis has got a boy. The weather is very delightful for bathing. I bathe nearly every morning before breakfast. I hope Susan won't die of envy, but perhaps she may still think it cold for that. The weather is likewise very favourable for boating, which I enjoy very much, though I hope papa won't hear from Mr. Chapman that it interferes with my studies. June 4, and Montem, June 9, are both very fast approaching. I should like to see you all at both, but I suppose I can only hope for the latter. I inclose a list of the things which are necessary for Montem, and which being much better and ten times cheaper had much better be got in London. Granby arrived a few days ago; he seems rather a nice boy, but I can't judge, as I hardly know him. Littleton is come and likes Eton very much, but was placed lower than he expected, being three removes below me. I hope if any plans are settled that I shall know of them. There is nothing going on, I suppose, in politics; I have heard of nothing if there is. I really have nothing more to say, so remember me to all, and believe me your most affectionate brother, 'GRANVILLE.'

ETON, *Thursday*.

'DEAREST GEORGY,—I sit down with the intention of merely writing a few lines to thank you for your *ungrammatical, unconnected* letter, but which gave me the greatest pleasure, perhaps more than one written with greater care would have done, as I could fancy you yourself opposite to me in your little room, making those remarks to me. By the bye, I believe that that is the greatest art in letter writing, to write as one would talk: perhaps grammar is a *slight* improvement in the eyes of some people. Since I wrote last

[1] Afterwards Lady Georgiana Fullerton.

to you, I have dined with a large number of other Eton boys, at a dinner given by some Oxonians, amongst whom were Canning and Lord Abercorn. I was shut up with the last in a sort of recess. I got on very well with him, though he completely denied ever having seen me before, or having ever himself been at Madame de Lieven's at Tunbridge. How good-looking he is! How stupid it was of me not to twig who "HamHam" was before to-day! I don't understand what you mean by *the lambkin*, and I am ashamed of your disrespect in calling Madame Galvani by such a nickname; however, to show that my displeasure is not to overwhelm you, I subjoin a little song which I heard sung by a ballad-singing woman the other day. As I thought it might act as a soothing reminiscence of your native county, I have copied it out.

'My love to all. Believe me, dearest Dody, your most affectionate brother, 'GRANVILLE.

'As for letters, the more the merrier.'

GRANVILLE LEVESON-GOWER TO THE HON. SUSAN LEVESON-GOWER.[1]

ETON, *Friday, June* 18, 1830.

'DEAR SUSAN,—Although you have reason to be angry with me, I do not think that you have any right to treat me in such a dreadfully severe and contemptuous manner. You seem to me to be the most dissipated people I know, although you say that it is such an undissipated season. I am really very sorry to say that the report about the Greek prize is not true, as there is no such thing at Eton, but I hope papa will hear a good report from Mr. Chapman, and though I am going to write a good deal about aquatic amusements, I do not think that he will accuse me of indulging in them *too* much. Last night I pulled and lost the match, which is a very awful thing indeed; we, the losers, being condemned to pay for an immense large dinner, twelve and sixpence, which I do not possess. Perhaps mama will say that I ought not to venture, if I had not got the money, but if you are in the boats you are obliged to pull. I certainly agree with you that Mr. Seymour has not got much in him, though he is a great talker, as Mary Hardy observed of him. How sorry I am that I shall not be able to see William. Perhaps if missy is married in London before the holidays, papa would get me leave to come to her marriage, like Charles Howard did to Mary Fox's.[2] We are all very much interested here about the King, and as much astonished as you can be at the improvement of his health. By the bye I forgot to tell you that Charles has got into the

[1] Afterwards Lady Rivers.

[2] Miss Wortley's marriage is here alluded to.

spouting club.[1] I must own that I should like to get in, and I think there is some chance of it; but I should be some time, I am afraid, before I should have resolution enough to make my maiden speech. I have been reading a book of Lord John Russell which Charles lent to me, which I like very much. Have any of you seen an article in the *Edinburgh Review* against Eton, or the answer which has been published to it? I must say that the last is much the best, though by far the most difficult part. I will write to Mademoiselle Eward.[2] Pray give my love to all. Believe me your most affectionate

'GRANVILLE.'

Granville Leveson-Gower was already a politician at Eton. He writes about this time how he has been up to London; and rejoices to have seen Lord John Russell 'looking as pert and undaunted as ever,' and tells his father how he is 'anxiously awaiting the news of the second reading of the Reform Bill.' The Roman Catholic question also, though decided in Parliament, was still awakening strong emotions in the minds of the youthful Etonians. 'We are all very much interested in politics,' he writes; 'I am squabbling all day. There is *No Popery* chalked up against the walls, and *Down with the turn-coats.* I am sorry to say that the anti-Catholic party is the most numerous here.' He promises his father that if the King comes down to Windsor, the liveliness of that town will be materially increased, as no doubt the Eton boys took care that it was; especially when, in addition to the excitement caused by the political questions of the day, a report was also convulsing the school that somebody at Court—vaguely described as 'he'—had proposed to found scholarships for modern languages. Against this revolutionary proposal it would appear the above-mentioned mural inscriptions were partly directed; for doubtless the average foreigner was a Roman Catholic, and his languages were the natural object of disgust and astonishment to Protestant Etonians, who were fully prepared to punch young Leveson-Gower's head for thinking otherwise, and for still further

[1] Mr. Charles Howard.

[2] The governess of the children of the Leveson-Gower family. Numerous references to her will be found in the *Life of Lady Georgiana Fullerton.*

offending by being able to talk quite fluently in one of them at least.

Of his Eton life an acquaintance with Charles Canning was one of the most precious results.

'I made acquaintance [Lord Granville wrote] with Charles Canning, called Carlo in the family, when I was a boy. My father, who was an intimate friend of his father's, took me one afternoon to Gloucester Lodge. Charles Canning led me into the kitchen garden, and gave me more raspberries than was good for me. I do not remember seeing much of him again till I went to Eton, where I found him in the fifth form, and where he took me under his protection.

'I had a fight in the playing fields during my first week. I had rather liked fighting at my private school, where it was reckoned cowardly to hit in the face, and where we used to thump one another's backs with mutual satisfaction. I was surprised to be knocked down by two blows on my cheeks. This happened each round, but I did not like to give in. Canning happened to pass, and suggested that we should make up—a suggestion of which I much approved, and to which my antagonist did not object. His kindness to me was continuous. His reputation at Eton was high as to ability. The respect and attachment felt for him by his contemporaries the same as was the case all his life.'

From Eton Granville Leveson-Gower passed to the tuition of Mr. Shore, a private tutor at Biggleswade, who prepared pupils for the Universities, from which it may be concluded that Eton had not proved the mother of an inconvenient amount of learning. The two brothers had perhaps been principally diligent in those studies which made them, as their mother observed, more able to take a proud position in Paris among the young men who were able to *soutenir les bals*, than to shine in writing bad Latin verses in imitation of Ovid, which was the main idea of education as then conducted at Eton.[1] His sister scolded him for his idleness and indifference to literature. One day he asked her 'what books then she really wanted him to read.' Lady Georgiana retorted that she thought there was no particular reason 'why he should not read a little modern history;' unaware,

[1] *Letters of Harriet, Lady Granville*, i. 406.

as she afterwards confessed, that she was speaking to a future Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs.[1]

At Oxford Granville Leveson-Gower matriculated in October 1832. His Parisian experiences were useful to him when the University broke out into the festivities of Commemoration.

'I liked the week [he writes to his mother] a great deal better than I expected. . . . The *painful* part of the proceedings was their giving me the Latin congratulatory ode to the Duke, to learn and recite in the Theatre before 3,000 people. I was very nervous; but got through without breaking down. They also made me one of the stewards of the public balls which were given. This I rather liked, as I had nothing to do or to arrange, but dance about with a white cockade in my coat buttonhole. The Duke himself was very enthusiastically received, but so was the Duke of Cumberland; and although there is certainly plenty of Toryism in Oxford, yet half the noise that was made arose from the pleasure of making it.'[2]

At Oxford he remained till 1836. Of this period of his life the fragment of a journal exists with a mock-heroic preface written by his college friend James Bruce,[3] who possibly knew that one of the weaknesses of the intending author was a lack of continuity of effort.

'I intend [the Preface said] that this journal shall contain a record of those events which mark my progress through the wilderness of life, and to that end it shall not be stuffed with facts, and dry fruitless occurrences, which affect rather the outward estate than he spirit of the narrator; but it shall convey, yea, with an exactitude to others incomprehensible, the history of events which convert or establish the mental constitution, whether by giving rise to new trains of thought, or by bringing to light principles possessed it may be, but unacknowledged before. For certain it is that the life of the soul is not to be measured by the periods of the almanac, nor by the revolution of the heavenly bodies, nor even by the intensity of our interests at certain times.'

Unfortunately 'the periods of the almanac' covered by the journal are of the shortest; 'the intensity of interests'

[1] *Life of Lady Georgiana Fullerton*, p. 34.

[2] July 19, 1834. The Duke of Wellington had been chosen Chancellor of the University of Oxford in 1834.

[3] Afterwards Earl of Elgin.

of a fashionable life in Paris having, it appears, proved fatal to it at an early date, as Mr. Bruce probably foresaw would be the case. It shows, however, that the habit of a wide if desultory reading, which Eton had checked, was again asserting itself, and that Lord Leveson—for by this name he has now to be spoken of—was getting 'entertainment' from books of all sorts, which, if some were rubbish, was after all 'a great deal'; for, as Dr. Johnson observed in similar circumstances to Topham Beauclerk, 'he'll get better books afterwards.' He reads a great deal of French literature of all sorts, travels, novels, and history, and dips into theology and philosophy, for it is the day of Lamennais and Cousin. The regular correspondence which he kept up with his talented sister would alone have been enough to prevent his mind lying fallow. Carrying the war into her own country, he is found engaged in a controversy with her on the subject of conversions to Catholicism. With the assurance characteristic of brothers who at an early age think they are entitled to lecture their sisters who have not had the advantage of receiving a University education, he sends Lady Georgiana a letter of six sides of advice and criticism, with an extract of more than two pages from the works of Archbishop Whately, and explains to one who, before many years were over, was to be one of the most brilliant of the converts brought by the Oxford Movement to the Roman obedience, that she evidently does not know what a 'church' really is. At another time he confidently warns her that when they next meet, she may expect 'to be knocked on the head with the arguments he had accumulated in favour of Wordsworth's new system of poetry;' but he has to admit that, notwithstanding his excursions into the nature of a church, the only book of Lamennais which he knows anything about is *Les Paroles d'un Croyant*, which he thinks 'beautiful in parts, though ful of sophisms and giving one a feeling of "what the deuce is he at?"' Charles Howard, he says, denounces the rhetorical style, while he himself unluckily admires it.[1] He cannot,

[1] 'I cannot place the *Paroles d'un Croyant* so high as his most recent biographer places it. Where Mr. Gibson sees awful grandeur, I find little more than passionate rhetoric.' W. S. Lilly, *Studies in Religion and Literature*, p. 177.

however, conceive that it can do much harm, though with a sudden attack of British patriotism he declares that he believes that 'the great mass of Frenchmen only require a few fine words to set them going.' This sentiment he further develops in an almost angry remonstrance written to his father against his possibly imagining that his son can attach the slightest importance to 'the parlez-vous,' when they assure his mother that she is the most beautiful woman in Paris.[1]

At Oxford he still further cemented his friendship with Charles Canning. 'I was about a year with him at Christ Church,' he relates, where he was one of a brilliant set—'Gladstone, Sidney Herbert, Lord Lincoln, James Hope. The present Dean of Christ Church, Dr. Scott, Lord Selborne, Lord Cardwell, and Lord Malmesbury had just taken their degrees; but Lord Elgin, Lord Dalhousie, Fred Bruce, Stephen Denison, and others were still there.' With all this it is nevertheless clear that Lord Leveson, notwithstanding his friendship with Charles Canning, did not seek at Oxford to emulate the distinguished University career of his cousin Lord Morpeth, and when the time for facing the examiners drew near, he hesitated about going up for his degree. Charles Canning, fearing a disaster, dissuaded him, all things considered, from making the attempt, as he thought a failure would be positively injurious; but his mother urged him to be bold, and let him know the keen disappointment which a contrary decision would be to her. There were few things in regard to which his mother's wishes could not prevail with Lord Leveson. He took the leap, and took it successfully: with the result that we read the name of Granville George Leveson-Gower, Lord Leveson, in the list of the commencing Bachelors of Art of the University of Oxford on February 14, 1839.[2]

The possession of a nickname among friends is said to be a sign of popularity. At Eton, Granville Leveson-Gower

[1] November 2, 1835.

[2] October 17, 1837. He seems to have put off taking his degree for some little time after passing the examination.

was 'Alcibiades:' at Oxford he was 'Crichton:' among his London friends he was 'Pussy,' a title he never lost; in his own family he was 'Gink,' a term the origin of which is wrapped in mystery. 'You are most kind about my dearest Gink,' his mother writes to her sister Lady Carlisle at this time; 'I never knew him so delightful, amiable, and gay, as during his short visit to us.' She also noted with satisfaction that he was able to steer his way skilfully between the rocks and sirens of society as well as through the figures of a quadrille. 'Leveson is in high spirits,' she tells her sister, 'but in love with nobody; very intimate again with Lady ——, who is playing her on-and-off game with many of the unwary; but he is I think aware, and safe.'[1] Nor was this favourable impression merely the result of a devoted mother's affection. 'Dear Lord Granville,' no less a person than Lord Holland wrote to the Ambassador, 'I write to tell you how extremely delighted all are with your son. He is one of the most pleasing lads I ever saw: such perfect manners and conversation and full of attainments. We have really all been much struck with him, and Rogers, the severest of critics, pronounced favourably.'[2] So with unblighted affections and with the nominal post of attaché to his father's Embassy, Lord Leveson on leaving Oxford enjoyed the best of what was to be found in Paris or in London, in a period when society, and especially political society, was exceptionally brilliant. 'He dines with Talleyrand, then in his zenith; attends the receptions of Madame de Flahault; is smiled upon by the beautiful Duchesse d'Istrie; never misses a ball at the Tuileries; is an habitué at the houses of the English aristocracy then resident in Paris—the Hopes, the Pembrokes, and many other families; while he enjoys the *entrée* of the *vie intime* of the entire diplomatic circle of Europe.'[3]

The embassy of Lord Granville in Paris coincided with one of the most distinguished epochs in the history of the

[1] *Letters of Harriet, Countess Granville*, ii. 244, 291.
[2] Lord Holland to Lord Granville (undated).
[3] Article 'The Mæcenas of Liberalism,' *World*, February 10, 1875.

society of the French capital: an epoch which, to quote the words of the biographer of Lady Georgiana Fullerton, resembled nothing else exactly which had preceded or which followed it. For

'a combination of circumstances gave conversation an unprecedented interest and charm. Many of the married ladies, whose early life may have been frivolous, transformed by the terrible experiences of adversity, impressed their hearers by the history of their sufferings and the difficulties which they had had to overcome. The men on their part, either because they had shared in the varied and strange experiences of exile, experiences painful in some cases, full of adventure in all, or because they had taken part in the famous battles the recent memory of which still lived, brought to the common stock something better than mere idle gossip, without at the same time ever mixing it with boredom and platitudes, thanks to a natural gaiety which had survived every trial. The society thus constituted was fanned by the breath of restored peace, which allowed strangers to come to Paris and Parisians to travel abroad, and lent to public and social life a sense of well-being which as yet had not grown into satiety. Paris more especially was the gainer. A number of *salons* had been reopened, and in them were to be found those pleasures of conversation always so dear to the inhabitants of France because in it they excel.'[1]

It is true that this era of revived hope, where the gaiety of the present jostled without offending the gravity of the past, was short-lived. Its apogee may perhaps be fixed in the last years of the Restoration. The Revolution of 1830 revived old hatreds and introduced new animosities. The world became divided, and *salons* were turned into hostile camps. Nevertheless, much of the brilliancy and charm of the earlier period still survived. Never certainly at any time was society more international. Talleyrand, once more recalled into activity, and now Ambassador to the Court of St. James's, was polishing his last barbed epigrams in whichever of the two capitals he chose to frequent. The heads of some great English houses, the Hopes and the Pembrokes and others, lived part of the year in Paris and part in London. Madame de Flahault the daughter of the English admiral to whom

[1] *Life of Lady Georgiana Fullerton*, p. 28.

Napoleon surrendered his sword on board the *Bellerophon*, and the wife of the French general who was Napoleon's aide-de-camp at Waterloo, closed her *salon* in Paris only to reopen it in London. The Orleanist magnates, De Broglie, Molé, Thiers, and Guizot, believing that the British Constitution, or something like it, was the panacea for all the ills of France, cultivated the personal friendship as well as the political example of the aristocracy which notwithstanding the Reform Bill still continued to govern England, whether Conservatism disguised itself under a Liberal hood with Melbourne and Palmerston, or Liberalism thought fit to figure as Conservatism under the ægis of the names of Peel and Aberdeen. In this brilliant and cosmopolitan society, of which the most political of diplomatists and the most diplomatic of politicians formed the solid centre, among great men and fair women Lord Leveson moved and had his being, and unconsciously following the advice which the Duke of Newcastle gave to Charles II., he gained from men rather than from books his own training for a political career,[1] and developed the practical sense of which one of his sisters had noted the existence at a very early age.[2]

[1] 'The great study and learning for kings is not to read bookes, but men.' Osmund Airy, *Charles II.* p. 169.

[2] 'La première fois que nous allâmes au théâtre, ce fut à Astley's. On donnait une pièce intitulée : *Le siège de Londonderry*, où mon frère Granville manifesta, à l'âge de cinq ans, le bon sens pratique dont il a fait preuve toute sa vie. Lorsque dans cette pièce les assiégés réduits aux dernières extrémités de la famine, voient enfin arriver le pain qu'on réussit à leur faire parvenir, ils expriment leur satisfaction par un chœur, qui surprit beaucoup mon petit frère ; et il s'écria : "Pourquoi font-ils : *ah ah*, au lieu de manger ce qu'on leur apporte?"' *Life of Lady Georgiana Fullerton*, p. 17.

CHAPTER II

ENTRY ON POLITICAL LIFE

1837–1851

FOR the son of Lord Granville and the grandson of Lord Gower a seat in the House of Commons was easily found, and in the last year of the first Parliament which had been elected under the Reform Act Lord Leveson at a bye-election became member for Morpeth, a borough where Lord Grey had influence, a vacancy having opportunely arisen owing to the Hon. Edward Howard, the sitting member, having accepted the Chiltern Hundreds on receiving the command of a ship. At the general election of 1837 Lord Leveson retained his seat without difficulty.

'I am delighted to think [his mother writes to Lady Carlisle] that dearest Leveson is so much interested and so keen about business; and also to hear from all of his popularity. He is become also such an excellent correspondent, and Granville delights in hearing from him so constantly.'[1]

She soon learnt that the dread ordeal—a young member's first speech—had been got over successfully. The Quadruple Alliance had just been formed by Great Britain, France, Spain, and Portugal, in order to clear the Peninsula of the two Pretenders Don Carlos and Don Miguel. The policy of the British Government in the matter was discussed on April 17. Lord Leveson sat in a little group behind the Ministerial bench next to Henry Bulwer, then member for Marylebone, who had made up his mind to join in the fray.

[1] *Letters of Harriet, Lady Granville*, ii. 229.



Kt. Thomas Lawrence, P.R.A. pinx. Walker & Atkins Sc.

1st Earl Granville.

With the easy patronage of an acquired reputation, Bulwer began conveying in muttered interruptions to his more youthful neighbours what he thought might be said in reply to the points brought up by successive orators on the other side. At last he rose himself, intending to reply to Sir Stratford Canning, who had just spoken. But Lord Leveson rose also, and enjoying the privilege accorded by custom to a new member wishing to address the House for the first time, was called by the Speaker. Bulwer thereupon to his astonishment heard the arguments which he had himself been developing stated by the youthful orator with perfect readiness, and supported by a mass of learning evidently culled from the rich store of his experience. Lord Leveson sat down amid loud cheers, and was warmly congratulated by Mr. Charles Wood, who followed him in debate.[1] It must be added that when Henry Bulwer had recovered from his surprise he enjoyed the joke as much as anybody, and was among the first to join in the general applause accorded to the member for Morpeth on the success of his maiden effort, though he afterwards tempered his praise, and perhaps intentionally, with the observation that the Ambassador had only to give his son a hint as to 'chusing' his *next* time of speaking well to confirm and fix a most favourable impression.[2]

'I must write you a word to congratulate you on Leveson's success last night [the leader of the House wrote to Lady Carlisle]. I never saw anything more promising in my life. He took all the strongest points, and showed great tact in the rapid and effective manner in which he disposed of them. He cannot but be a good debater, if he perseveres.'[3]

The fame of Lord Leveson's success, stamped with the seal of Lord John Russell's approval, soon reached Paris on friendly wings. We hear of no less a person than the Princesse de Lieven 'gasping for breath and crying over the young speech,' and of the Chancellerie of the Paris Embassy

[1] *Hansard*, third series, xxxvii. 1366. Mr. H. Bulwer did not speak till the next day, April 18.

[2] Sir Henry Bulwer to Lord Granville, April 19, 1837.

[3] Lord John Russell to the Countess of Carlisle, April 18, 1837.

making preparations 'to chair the new member in the court-yard on his return.'[1]

Lord Leveson was called upon to move the Address in the following session. He related in after years how, together with the seconder of the Address, Mr. Gibson Craig, the member for the county of Edinburgh, he had the honour of calling on Lord Melbourne, and how kindly they were received:

'how the Prime Minister communicated to us the heads of the Royal Speech which was to be delivered; told us that he had no doubt we should admirably discharge our duty, and referred us to the heads of departments for any further details that we might wish to obtain. We went to the different departments and were kindly received by the several "heads;" but somehow or other the head of the Colonial Office thought it would be better for us to adhere to foreign and home affairs; the Foreign Secretary thought we had better confine ourselves to the affairs of the Home Office; while that was the only subject which the Home Secretary thought we had better avoid.'

The result was that they were obliged to be content 'with mainly expatiating on the coming glories of the new reign:' a course which was at least safe, though it incurred the risk of prophecy.[2] Notwithstanding this trying pilgrimage from one department to another, and the terrors incident to addressing the House of Commons in the glory of a resplendent uniform, Lord Leveson succeeded in performing his somewhat thankless task to the general satisfaction of the party, and in the course of the year still further increased his reputation by a short speech on the Tithes Bill.[3] But with innate tact he avoided the error of marring the effect of his early efforts by too frequent appearances in public.

The time was now drawing near when his father, the Ambassador, was about to retire from his post, owing to failing health. But before the final moment arrived, he had had the satisfaction of hearing that his son had been appointed Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs, the exact post which he himself would have selected for him and most

[1] *Letters of Harriet, Countess Granville*, ii. 224, 236.
[2] *Hansard*, third series, clxiii. 24.
[3] *Ibid.* xxxix. 31–36.

desired to see him occupy. Lord Palmerston was Secretary of State.

'Dearest Leveson! [Lady Granville writes to her sister] my time is taken up with answering notes of congratulation, and to-night I expect my throat to be sore with explanations and thanks.'[1]

'I like the thought of it very much [the new Under-Secretary wrote to his father a few days after taking possession of his office]. Though it is rather hard work, it is all of a pleasant kind, and I am in great spirits about it. . . . I think I may be of use, from having more opportunities of seeing Lord Palmerston, and not being so dreadfully afraid of him. It is impossible to have a glimpse of him in the office. He comes down very late, having kept quantities of people waiting for him; and before he has seen them all, goes down to the House. The clerks detest him, and have an absurd sort of fancy that he takes pleasure in bullying them.' 'The part I find most disagreeable [he writes a few days later] is the correction of the drafts of despatches drawn out by some of the oldest and best clerks of the office. J. Bandinell for instance, who I believe knows as much about his department, the Slave Trade, as anyone can know on such a subject, expresses himself very awkwardly.[2] It is disagreeable to me to correct, as if he was a schoolboy, all his sentences; besides my not having very great confidence in my own English. And yet, if I do not do this, Palmerston sends it back, slashed about with very cutting observations.'[3]

Lord Leveson's letters at this time show traces of the alarm which he felt not only at the peppery criticisms of his chief upon style, but at the still more peppery instructions with which the British Ambassadors were frequently favoured for the benefit of the foreign courts to which they were accredited. War with France about the Egyptian and Syrian questions had been narrowly avoided, and official diplomacy was supposed to be rejoicing over the restoration of cordial relations; but the Under-Secretary asks the Ambassador in the strictest confidence of filial relations whether he thinks their chief is really rejoicing so much after

[1] *Letters of Harriet, Countess Granville*, ii. 299.

[2] James Bandinell was a clerk in the Foreign Office from 1799 to 1845. He was head of the Slave Trade Department.

[3] Lord Leveson to Lord Granville, March 10, 20, 1840.

all. One serious result among others of these 'peppery instructions' was a dispute in the Cabinet, which almost ended in a rupture and the break-up of the Government. In 1839 Lord Clarendon, who, owing to his long diplomatic experience and personal ability, carried great weight on all foreign questions, had entered the Cabinet as Lord Privy Seal; but he soon found himself in conflict with the views of Lord Palmerston on the Syrian question, and supporting those of Lord Holland. This attitude he continued to maintain after the death of Lord Holland in October 1840. Lord Palmerston became convinced that Lord Clarendon wished to enact the same part which Lord Ellenborough, when Lord Privy Seal, had wished to play towards Lord Aberdeen in 1828, and to supplant him at the Foreign Office.[1] Lord Clarendon was at the time *persona grata* at Court—Lord Palmerston was not so, and knew it; and he gradually became deeply incensed.

'The Palmerstons [Lord Leveson tells his father] are angry with Clarendon and talk too much at him. He on his side says that he has never said anything to anyone against Palmerston, and that if this talk goes on, he shall retire. If he retires, Lord John says that he will go too, not because he has disagreed with Palmerston, but because he thinks Clarendon and Lord Holland have been ill used; in short, it is a great mess altogether. . . . Lady Palmerston said she was convinced that Clarendon had getting into the Foreign Office himself for an object, and that he was an intriguer.'[2]

When Lord Leveson tried to explain matters, Lady Palmerston only told him that he was 'a good-hearted young man' and 'incapable of realising the depth of the cunning of his friend George Villiers.' These little political confidences which passed between father and son were varied by the conveyance of the current gossip and the good stories of the day; as, for example, that the Rev. Sydney Smith had just paid a visit to the Prime Minister in order to urge on the latter the continuance and extension of the powers of the Charity Commission, which had just concluded the issue of the first series of reports commenced in 1819. But

[1] *Political Diary of Lord Ellenborough*, 1828–30, i. 127–138.
[2] Lord Leveson to Lord Granville, December 11, 1840.

Lord Melbourne only indulged in a series of oaths and expletives, whereupon Sydney Smith said, 'Now, my lord, let us consider the whole question as d——d and proceed to discuss it.'[1] The Ambassador was an exigeant correspondent. So was Lady Granville. Notwithstanding the testimonial quoted above to his regularity as a writer, his father and mother were constantly complaining that their son did not write even oftener; but considering the number of Lord Leveson's still extant letters, it may be said that the Ambassador's standard was evidently a high one, and a letter by every post would probably have only resulted in Lady Granville's affection for her son causing her to ask for two.

It must also be admitted that, notwithstanding the continuity of his domestic correspondence, no less a person than Mr. Speaker considered it his duty to warn the new member about this time that in regard to his political work

'the present was a very critical time in his life, and that if he continued to abandon himself to indolence, all his remarkable faculties would be dissipated; while if he would but make a resolute effort he was convinced that he might reach the highest posts.'[2]

But Mr. Speaker Abercromby was not the only Mentor, for very shortly after his appointment the new Under-Secretary was informed by his official chief that he was not apparently so regular in his attendance at the Foreign Office as he might be, or as his predecessors were reputed to have been. 'His attentions had no doubt been elsewhere.' Lord Palmerston was perhaps aware of events which were veiled from the gaze and knowledge of the Speaker, and had guessed that it would shortly be announced, as it was, that a marriage was about to take place between the Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs and Marie Louise, the only child of Émeric Joseph, Duc de Dalberg, and widow of Sir Richard Acton of Aldenham in Shropshire. The career of the Dalberg family had been in many lands and under various governments. The lot of the Duke had fallen in those strange days when in the

[1] Lord Leveson to Lord Granville, March 5, 1841.
[2] *Life of Lady Georgiana Fullerton*, p. 112.

last decade of the eighteenth and the first of the nineteenth century territories were being so constantly transferred and boundaries so frequently altered, that no citizen felt sure that on waking next morning he might not find himself the subject of a Sovereign other than that to whom he had the previous day owed allegiance. Of such changes the Duc de Dalberg was a conspicuous example, and a complete treatise on the law of nationality and domicile could be based on the various situations created by his frequent migrations and voluntary or involuntary changes of position in Church and State. The Prince Primate, Charles Dalberg, Bishop of Ratisbon, was the last Arch-Chancellor of the Holy Roman Empire. On the dissolution of the Empire the Bishop had sided with France, and was appointed President of the Confederation of the Rhine. His nephew and heir, Émeric, attached himself to Napoleon and became a naturalised French subject—and Duc de Dalberg. He was a member of the Provisional Government of 1814 and accompanied Talleyrand as plenipotentiary to the Congress of Vienna. Of the great possessions of the Arch-Chancellor, the beautiful property of Herrnsheim on the Rhine alone escaped the effects of the long period of war and confiscations. It descended to Émeric Dalberg, and after him to his daughter and the child of her first marriage, the celebrated historian afterwards Lord Acton.

The Actons were almost as international a family as the Dalbergs.[1] A younger branch, transferring itself from England to France and then from France to Italy, had given to the Neapolitan service the famous Admiral who drove the French in 1798 out of Southern Italy, and at one moment had been Prime Minister as well as *generalissimo* of all the sea

[1] 'The Dalbergs had been settled at Herrnsheim near Worms for many centuries. The legend runs that a relation of our Saviour who became a Roman soldier settled at Herrnsheim and was the ancestor of the Dalbergs. It is certain that the family was long looked upon as one of the most illustrious in Germany. After the coronation of the Roman Emperors it was always the custom when the honour of knighthood was about to be conferred upon any individual to ask if no Dalberg was present. If so he would be the first to receive the honour. "Ist kein Dalberg da?" is a well-known expression in Germany.' (*Times*, June 20, 1902.)

and land forces of Naples. A brother of the Admiral played a distinguished part in the same service; and a nephew became a cardinal of the Church. By the extinction of the elder or English branch of the house, the Admiral succeeded in 1791 to the title and the estates of Aldenham in Shropshire and thus became the head of the family. His son and heir, Sir Richard Acton, had married the sole heiress of the Dalbergs, Marie Pelline de Dalberg. Left a widow early in life, she was now about to become Lady Leveson *en secondes noces*. Lady Georgiana tells admiringly of the open mind and perfect frankness of her new sister-in-law, her rectitude and deep sense of religion, and other noble qualities which she feels will recommend Lady Leveson to her correspondent, the Duke of Devonshire, always the friendly confessor of all his nephews and nieces.

'Here are Leveson and Lady Acton just arrived in a *petite voiture* [she writes from the Embassy] as happy as children. She is learning to drive. They go out every day boating, and she learns to row. . . . She exerts herself in every way to gain the goodwill of the family.' [1]

The marriage took place on March 25, 1840. The honeymoon was spent at Chiswick and at Aldenham, and soon afterwards the newly married couple, on official life intent, settled in a house in Bruton Street which had belonged to the Ambassador, one floor of which was then occupied by Charles Greville, whom his friends therefore called the 'Lodger,' though others preferred to call him the 'Gruncher' owing to the sardonic and cynical tone of his criticisms of life and affairs, which his friends attributed to the fear of constantly recurring attacks of gout. But the heart of the Gruncher was really a warm and kindly one; and his liberal sympathies were strong; nor did gout ever mar the cordiality of his relations with the occupants of the floor below, whose political guide he aspired to be.

Lord Leveson's tenure of the post of Under-Secretary was, however, not to be prolonged, for in August 1841 the Melbourne Government came to the end of a troubled

[1] *Life of Lady Georgiana Fullerton*, p. 116.

existence. The great wave of enthusiasm which had carried Lord Grey into power had for some time past been ebbing. Large sections of the newly enfranchised middle-class electorate were already showing Conservative instincts, when the grievances from which they themselves suffered had mostly been removed. The need of the hour was felt to be a successful financier rather than a constitutional reformer. But the Whigs had been unable to develop a great financier in their own ranks, and had as yet failed in attracting one from outside.

When Lord Leveson succeeded Mr. Edward Howard in the vacancy at Morpeth, it was on the understanding that on the return of the latter from his command, he should himself retire, and in February 1840 the Hon. Edward Howard was accordingly again elected, Lord Leveson having accepted the Chiltern Hundreds and thereby vacated the seat. At the general election of 1841 Lord Leveson, without a seat for himself, was able to throw himself into the struggle on behalf of his friends with all the more alacrity, especially in his own county. On the South Staffordshire hustings he became the object of a violent attack by a Mr. Williams, who appears to have viewed the presence of a Whig in that county with an indignation equal to that of Dr. Johnson in the previous century. We all remember the famous conversation on the origin of parties. 'I drank chocolate, sir, this morning with Mr. Eld, and to my no small surprise found him to be a *Staffordshire Whig*,' said Boswell. 'Sir,' replied the Doctor, 'there are rascals in all counties.' 'Eld said,' continued Boswell, 'that a Tory was a creature generated between a nonjuring parson and one's grandmother.' 'And I have always said,' retorted Johnson, 'the first Whig was the devil.' 'He certainly was, sir,' replied the submissive Boswell.

Such evidently was also the opinion of Mr. Williams, who considered that Lord Leveson had no better right to be in Staffordshire in 1841 than Mr. Eld in the previous century, and he accordingly proceeded to deal faithfully with Lord Leveson on the hustings.

'We went to Lichfield on Sunday evening [Lord Leveson wrote to his father, giving an account of this episode], and we none of us knew whether there would be a contest for S. Staffordshire or not till we were upon the hustings. A Mr. Smith of London (rather a vague appellation) put out an address, but did not appear on the hustings. Mr. Williams, an iron master, in seconding Lord Ingestre, made an attack on me. Before we broke up, I appealed to the courtesy of the electors to hear a few words of personal explanation. Mr. Williams had made an attack on me, an attack of which I did not complain although it might have been more courteous to have delayed that attack until I had offered myself as a candidate. He said that he and the majority of freeholders had never heard of my name, that I had never spoken in Parliament, or worked in committees. "Now, gentlemen," I said, "I am twenty-six years old, I have been out of Parliament for a year and a half, and as no one can be elected till they are twenty-one, I appeal to you all whether four years is sufficient for a young man to make himself a great parliamentary name. To such I have no pretensions, but as to my name being unknown in Staffordshire, I utterly deny it; I am proud of my name, because it belongs to a family which has received more kindness from the inhabitants of Staffordshire than it can ever repay, but I have yet to learn that any member of that family has done anything to make them undeserving of that kindness and confidence. Mr. Williams says that I never spoke in the House of Commons. Now it happens that before I was twenty-two years old I did speak. I do not say that it was sensible; I do not say that it was prudent; I am not clear that it was not very impudent to have done so; but I did speak, and I was listened to with indulgence by the House, and some months afterwards I was selected by the Government to move the first Address of the House of Commons to our present most gracious Queen. I spoke once again, and if I had spoken oftener at that age, and with my inexperience, I put it to those who now hear me, whether I should not have made myself liable to the imputation of wasting the time of the House of Commons. As to committees, I had always attended the committees belonging to the county and the borough which I then represented. I have also attended a committee on education; and more than that, day after day, although I was not connected with the parliamentary representation of Staffordshire, I attended the Manchester Extension Bill, in which Staffordshire was deeply interested." I thanked them for the indulgence with which they had heard me, and apologised for the egotistical statement I had made, but I had been brought up from my childhood with such strong feelings about Staffordshire and its

inhabitants, that I could not allow anything to pass which might lower me in their good opinion." I was very much cheered, and Mr. Williams sent me an apology.'

But the election was a disaster. 'We are routed horse and foot,' was Lord Leveson's summary. 'It is no reaction, but great political apathy, and the registration has been attended to by the Tories, and completely neglected by us.'[1] It was not till the month of September 1841 that he was himself able to find a seat. Sir George Anson, one of the Whig members for Lichfield, a safe seat, fortunately retired, and Lord Leveson was returned in his place without a contest.

The rout of his political friends in England was chosen by the Ambassador as the right moment for his own retirement. He had once before resigned, when, on the fall of Lord Melbourne's first Ministry in 1834, he feared that in the new occupants of office he might lack the necessary support; but his resignation practically took no effect, for on the return of Lord Melbourne to power in the following year he once more was appointed to the Paris Embassy. A slight touch of paralysis in 1840 was, however, a warning that the end of his long diplomatic career was near, and the final defeat of Lord Melbourne was felt by him to be a suitable moment for uttering his *Vos plaudite ac valete.*

A contemporary said of Lord Leveson at this time that he was

'an attentive and promising young nobleman, who, aided by the good fortune which had attended him from the beginning of his career, might become distinguished and even famous; but as yet was rather known as a courtly politician well versed in the smaller diplomacies of politics, who had failed, and perhaps had hardly attempted, to impress the House of Commons with possessing the gifts of perseverance and application without which success is difficult.'[2]

[1] Lord Leveson to Lord Granville, July 6, 1841.

[2] See some observations on his career in the *South Australian Register*, April 2, 1891. I have referred in the Preface to the valuable assistance which I have received from the obituary notices of Lord Granville in various newspapers, published in 1891.

Mr. Williams's attack on the Staffordshire hustings indicates some failings of the kind. Nor in the period immediately succeeding the fall of the Melbourne Administration did Lord Leveson do much to remove this impression. During the five years from 1841 to 1846 when the Whigs were in opposition, he was almost necessarily condemned to comparative silence on the questions connected with his former office, for Lord Palmerston then sat in the House of Commons. He was also more and more feeling but an imperfect sympathy with the ideals of Lord Palmerston in foreign affairs, and transferring his intellectual allegiance to the school of which the leader in the House of Commons was his friend Charles Villiers, and with him he steadily voted for the repeal of the Corn Laws. The Whigs in the House were also greatly disheartened.

'London [Lord Leveson writes at this time to his father] has been very pleasant, but there appears to be a most complete apathy about politics. Nobody mentions them; and Tories and Whigs live on the best terms possible. I always think the Whigs less bitter animals than their opponents. I don't think we have a chance for at least three or four years of getting in. I dined at Windsor Castle last night after the Cup race at Ascot. The Queen asked after you. She does not see much of her Whig friends, but is very civil when she does.'[1]

A new field was, however, about to open itself. In 1846 the Ambassador died; and Lord Leveson suddenly found himself translated to the Upper House. The repeal of the Corn Laws had only just been carried, and the political atmosphere was still hot not only with the contests of ancient foes, but with the recriminations of former friends; nor had the Old Guard of the Tory party, brilliantly led by their whilom antagonist, Lord Stanley, entirely abandoned the hope that the final word in the controversy had not yet been spoken. The death of the Ambassador coincided with the fall of the Administration of Sir Robert Peel; and as the controversy over the Corn Laws might be reopened at any moment, the addition of a new recruit, pledged in

[1] Lord Leveson to Lord Granville, June 10, 1842.

favour of Free Trade, to the none too numerous ranks of that section of opinion in the House of Lords, was a welcome event.

'Before I came of age [Lord Granville afterwards wrote] I became an absolute Free-trader; and at the same time, but with still less study and reflection, I convinced myself that the laws of England and of France on the subject of the disposal of property after death were both in the extreme.'[1]

The early surroundings of Lord Granville's life had left him far more intellectually free to pick and choose his own opinions than were many of his school and college contemporaries. It was one of the peculiarities of his position—to which he sometimes alluded in conversation—that his own early training had been in many respects different from that of the other members of the Upper House. As a boy he had lived abroad far more than most Englishmen of his class. His father, though closely allied with the greatest territorial connection in the country, had never himself resided on his English estates, which were regarded as a source of mining and manufacturing wealth rather than of agricultural enterprise, and he had not brought up his children among those class prejudices which, unless met by some strong counteracting circumstances, tend to produce the type which embodied itself in the Tory aristocracy of the commencement of the century: a type of which strength degenerating into obstinacy, and pride passing into selfishness, are the distinguishing characteristics. This class, if able to claim the Duke of Wellington as the product of the system—not that any such claim can be substantiated—found its ordinary and natural expression in the narrow mediocrities of the Liverpool Administration and their successors. In 1831 they had brought England to the verge of revolution by refusing the parliamentary vote to the middle classes of the country, and they had just risked causing a civil war by refusing cheap

[1] Lord Granville to Lord Hartington, December 21, 1883. Lord Granville, the Ambassador, was one of the Peers who in 1815 entered a protest on the Journals of the House of Lords against the Corn Laws 'in words which might have been written by Cobden.'—J. S. Nicholson, *History of the English Corn Laws*, p. 39.

food to the people. Only by the fortunate desertion of their leaders at the most critical moment of the struggle were they saved from incurring the consequences of their own unwisdom. From this class Lord Granville both by temperament and as the son of one of the strongest supporters of Mr. Canning was severed, and the conclusions which his early environment had rendered possible, his acquired opinions afterwards confirmed. Lord Granville's first speech as a peer was made on the question of the abolition of the Corn Laws. At a time when many of the Whig leaders were still hesitating, he had declared himself, while still a member of the House of Commons, in favour of total abolition. He now at once stepped into the breach in the House of Lords to resist those who were scheming how to abolish the recent abolition; and whenever in after years the attempt was made to impugn the great principles for which the battle had been successfully fought, Lord Granville was found holding the fort.

'I am a very old Free-trader now [he told the House of Lords in 1879]. More than forty years ago, in opposition to the opinions of my political friends, I voted for the total repeal of the Corn Laws, and I never after gave a vote contrary to those principles. My love has been of a constant character.' [1]

On the formation of Lord John Russell's Government in 1846, Lord Granville not unnaturally hoped to receive political office. It was therefore with some disappointment that he only received from the Prime Minister the offer of a Court appointment in the shape of the Mastership of the Buckhounds, an office never regarded as one of political importance, although two of its occupants at a remote period of history—as a recent Master has pleaded in bar of a sentence of abolition—had succeeded in conferring distinction on the post by involving themselves in certain dark conspiracies and getting executed for high treason and other grave crimes and misdemeanours. Lord Granville used afterwards to say that apparently these important facts had not sufficiently impressed themselves on the mind

[1] *Hansard*, ccxlv. 1397.

of his friend Lord Stanley of Alderley, for one day when he himself and Lord Bessborough—the latter of whom had also been Master—were discussing with Lord Stanley the distribution of offices on the formation of Lord Palmerston's Cabinet in 1859, Lord Stanley observed to him with reference to one of the suggested names, 'That fellow is the sort of d——d fool who is about fit for the Buckhounds:' an observation which he immediately afterwards seemed anxious to qualify, observing present company. There were not wanting those who advised Lord Granville to show resentment and decline Lord John Russell's offer. While still hesitating he sought the advice of Lord Lansdowne, and was told by him that 'he had never yet known it go against a man's political career to have something to give up.'[1] The wisdom of this advice was seen in about a year's time, when a Court appointment being wanted for another supporter of the Ministry in the House of Lords, Lord Granville expressed himself ready to facilitate the arrangement by relinquishing the Buckhounds, in order to become the parliamentary member of the Commission on Railways appointed under a recent Act, out of which the jurisdiction of the Board of Trade has gradually been since developed. As such he became the mouthpiece of the Commission in the House of Lords; and when in 1848 the Board of Trade was regularly constituted, with Mr. Labouchere as President, he not unnaturally became the first Vice-President.

The allegiance of Lord Granville to the Free-trade views of Mr. Villiers was expected by Lord John Russell to recommend Lord Granville's appointment; but it was not so at Manchester, and Mr. Bright raged and stormed against the nomination of the former Master as an insult to the commercial classes. The wits of the period represented the borough member asking the ex-Master of the Buckhounds: 'Is thy servant *a dog*, that he should do this thing?' It was also discovered that the appointment was only another instance of Whig nepotism, because Lord Granville was related to Lord John Russell through the latter's grand-

[1] Lord Ribblesdale, *The Queen's Hounds*, ch. xiii. pp. 222, 223.

mother. 'Lord John's grandmother' became consequently a favourite subject of wit and jest, as the Mother Eve of the whole Cabinet, and was the theme of more than one heated controversy in the House, Mr. Bernal Osborne distinguishing himself by accounting on physiological principles for the ricketiness of the legislative offspring of the Cabinet, on the ground that nearly all the members of the Cabinet were closely related to each other owing to their common relationship to this ancient and illustrious lady.

Further promotion came in 1847, when Lord Macaulay lost his seat in Edinburgh, and in consequence resigned the post as Paymaster-General, which was then conferred on Lord Granville. This, however, only embittered the attacks already made; and it was fortunate that an opportunity quickly arose which enabled Lord Granville to justify Lord John Russell's selection and even to convert the critics of the appointment in the great commercial centres into ardent supporters. In 1850 the idea of holding in London an International Exhibition of the products of the trade and commerce of all the nations of the earth first took definite shape. To whom, under the superior command of the Prince Consort, should the general direction of the complicated undertaking be given? Public opinion indicated that the person selected ought to possess an independent position placing him above even the suspicion of interested motives and petty intrigue: a character able to smooth over inevitable friction and jealousies by conciliatory manners: an acquaintance with the business world sufficient to keep him in touch with the classes without whose support the Exhibition would be a certain failure; and a knowledge of foreign languages and ideas which would enable him to understand the wishes of those outside this country whose co-operation was necessary in order to insure success—certain as they were to be punctilious as to priority of place and the importance accorded to their various exhibits. At the same time a man was required well able to make the foreign exhibitors and their representatives understand English ideas and susceptibilities. In Lord Granville the exceptional combination of these various gifts

and qualifications was quickly recognised both by the Prince Consort and also by 'the man with the umbrella on the top of the omnibus' whose pronouncements Lord Palmerston considered at this period of history to be the surest index to public opinion. Mr. Bright again sneered at such a task being entrusted to an 'ex-Master of Buckhounds,' little foreseeing the day when the ex-Master and himself would be members of the same Cabinet, and regarded as perhaps more closely connected in opinion than any other two members of the Government. But Mr. Bright was among the very first to acknowledge his error, and to confirm the unanimous verdict which by the autumn of 1851 had decided that the Great Exhibition was a success, and that a large part of that success was due to the tact of the 'ex-Master,' to whose activity testimony was borne by an anecdote, that on the day of the opening, when at the last moment the arrangements were found a little backward, he was seen, broom in hand, vigorously sweeping up the refuse scattered about the dais, half an hour before the time fixed for the arrival of the Royal and distinguished personages who were to perform the ceremony.

At the end of the year M. Sallandrouze, the manufacturer of the celebrated Aubusson carpets, who had been one of the principal French Commissioners, conveyed on behalf of his colleagues and the City of Paris an invitation to the British Commissioners to visit the French capital in August, where a series of festivities was being organised in their honour. This invitation was conveyed to the Prince Consort through Lord Granville. The Prince—having refused all festivities connected with the Exhibition in England—felt himself obliged to decline the invitation, though accompanied with a personal invitation from the Prince President to be his guest at the Élysée. His place was accordingly taken by Lord Granville, and at a great official banquet at the Hôtel de Ville he was able to 'charm his hosts by responding for the Commissioners, whose health formed the toast of the day, in a French speech free and flowing and full of telling points.'[1]

[1] Martin, *Life of the Prince Consort*, ii. 388.

Lord Granville was now admitted to the Cabinet. The Exhibition had been a valuable asset for Lord John Russell's Government, as the tide of material prosperity which it heralded floated the Government safely over the political rocks on which more than once in the session of 1851 their ship had all but struck. But a succession of lucky escapes cannot go on for ever, and in the last days of the year grave events occurred which indirectly were to prove fatal to the Government before many months were over. 'I have a particular reason for wishing you *not* to come to the Cabinet on Monday,' Lord John Russell wrote to Lord Granville on December 20, 'I will tell you of it afterwards.'[1] Lord Palmerston had suddenly disappeared from the Foreign Office, owing to a renewal of the old difficulties as to the proper relations of that office with the Crown and the Prime Minister. Acting on his own responsibility he had expressed to the French Ambassador his entire approbation of the act of the President in regard to the *coup d'état* of December 1851; and the Prime Minister had summarily dismissed him. It was generally believed that Lord Clarendon, then Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, was most likely to be Lord Palmerston's successor; but a chivalrous unwillingness existed in his mind to desert his post at a moment when Ireland was reeling under the effects of the famine, and his administration was still the object of misrepresentation and attack. To prevent acceptance on his part, there may have been another reason also.[2] As already seen, Lord Palmerston was at one time convinced that an intrigue had been on foot, participated in by Lord Clarendon himself, to substitute the then Lord Privy Seal for himself at the Foreign Office. Lord Clarendon probably did not desire to give any opportunity to unscrupulous tongues to accuse him of profiting personally by the ejection of the Foreign Secretary from the office which he had been charged with coveting a few years before. Lord Clarendon having refused, Lord John Russell, with characteristic boldness, determined to offer the vacant post

[1] Lord John Russell to Lord Granville, December 20, 1851.

[2] Greville, *Journal of the Reign of Queen Victoria*, 1837–1852, iii. 428.

to Lord Granville though a comparatively new and untried man.

Lord Granville had occasionally appeared as the mouthpiece of the Government in the House of Lords on foreign questions.

'I well remember [says the Duke of Argyll] that some years before 1851, Granville had to answer some questions in the Lords on behalf of the Government. This he did with a discretion and in a manner which attracted the long-experienced eye of Lord Aberdeen, who turned to me when Granville sat down, and said, "I think this is the best man they've got."'[1]

Thus it was that, before the last days of 1851 were over, Lord Granville found himself installed in the chair in Downing Street whence Lord Palmerston had defied his colleagues, had flouted his Sovereign, had dominated Europe, and had made himself the idol of the British middle classes and the object of the intense hatred of all those whom the First Napoleon had comprehensively described as *les vieux pantalons de la diplomatie.* Lord Canning, the chosen friend of his Oxford days, was among the first to offer his congratulations.

'The fact [he said] that you come in the place of Palmerston and his bad odour, that you are in your own person a sort of peace offering and concession to those who disapprove of him, and at the same time the security which I suppose you may feel that he will not turn upon you as a political opponent, are so many elements of comfort. Even the stormy appearance of events abroad has its advantages, as there is little risk of your making a mistake to your own personal discredit, when the state of things is such as to compel more than the usual attention and responsibility of colleagues. A small unexpected difficulty in quiet times might be much more dangerous, as far as your own self is concerned. . . . I suppose there must be a revolution in Bruton Street, a new cook, no more cheap candles, no hunting pony, perhaps an improvement in hacks, and a new lining to the chariot. I hope not the removal of the "Lodger," though if required you might do it civilly by sending him on a special mission to the Barbary pirates.'[2]

[1] Note by the Duke of Argyll among Lord Granville's papers.
[2] Lord Canning to Lord Granville, December 26, 1851.

To Lord Lansdowne, who was the Liberal leader in the House of Lords, Lord Granville conveyed his sense of astonishment at his own sudden translation in the following letter :—

LORD GRANVILLE TO LORD LANSDOWNE.

December 23, 1851.

'DEAR LORD LANSDOWNE,—I have not yet recovered from my surprise at my own audacity. I hope you will not let the Shelburnes laugh at me too much. I presume the points of attack will be my incompetency; the neglect of strengthening that which is weakened by the loss of an able man; the adoption of Lord Aberdeen's policy, now that the only man is gone who cared for the popular cause in Europe; and that the whole is the result of a Court intrigue to displace one who was too powerful to be influenced, and to replace him by one under the influence of the Court. The two first objections are strong. I hope that we shall be able to show that the two last are not true.

'Believe me, my dear Lord Lansdowne, in every position,

'Very gratefully yours, GRANVILLE.'

CHAPTER III

THE FOREIGN OFFICE, DECEMBER 1851 TO FEBRUARY 1852

THE good will of Lord Aberdeen was an important factor to whoever might be the occupant of the Foreign Office.

'Lord John [he wrote to a friend] seems to have been determined to have his own *coup d'état*, as well as the President; but although it has taken the world by surprise, I have been nearly as well prepared for one as for the other. The last drop which caused the cup to overflow, I do not exactly know, although I may guess what it was. At all events, I think the nomination of Lord Granville excellent. If the direction of the foreign policy of the country is to be in the hands of any member of Lord John's Government, he is the man I should have chosen. He is sufficiently liberal; but at the same time he is conciliatory and safe. His appointment will give great satisfaction, and will go far to remove some very serious embarrassments. I am quite certain that in the country there is very little notion of the real state of our relations with the whole world. It was perfectly unparalleled, and pregnant with danger. I shall be curious to see what is to be the result at home. Both Radicals and Protectionists want a leader, and both will bid high for one. Who will obtain him?'[1]

It was even more important that Lord Palmerston welcomed his successor with perfect cordiality and admirable good humour. 'Ah, how are you, Granville? Well, you have got a very interesting office, but you will find it very laborious; seven or eight hours' work every day will be necessary for the current business, besides the extraordinary and parliamentary; and with less than that you will fall into arrears.' He then 'entered into a complete history of our diplomacy, gave him every sort of information and even advice; spoke of the Court without bitterness; and in strong

[1] December 26, 1851, copy among Lord Granville's papers.

terms of the Queen's sagacity,' and ended by desiring Lord Granville to apply to him whenever he pleased for any information or assistance which could be useful.[1]

Lord Granville's first step was to appoint a new Under-Secretary. He made a noteworthy selection in the person of Mr. Henry Layard, who in 1848 had become famous by the publication of his discoveries in the neighbourhood of Mosul, at Koyunjik, the site of the ancient Nineveh, and possessed an unrivalled knowledge of the East.[2] He was at the moment without a seat in the House of Commons, but was known to be ambitious of parliamentary honours.

Lord Granville's earliest experience of his new duties was a peculiar one. The Queen, irritated by the constant disputes with Lord Palmerston and alarmed at the threatening appearance of the prospect in Europe consequent on the *coup d'état* of December 2, 1851, took the unusual step of asking Lord Palmerston's successor to explain his general views in a memorandum. Her Majesty's letter ran as follows :—

WINDSOR CASTLE, *December* 28, 1851.

'The Queen thinks the moment of the change in the person of her Secretary for Foreign Affairs to afford a fit opportunity to have the principles upon which our foreign affairs have been conducted since the beginning of 1848 reconsidered by Lord John Russell and his Cabinet.

'The Queen was fully aware that the storm raging at that time on the Continent rendered it at that time impossible for any statesman to foresee with clearness and precision what development and direction its elements would take, and she consequently quite agreed that the line of policy to be followed as the most conducive to the interests of England could then only be generally conceived and vaguely expressed.

'But although the Queen is still convinced that the general principles laid down by Lord John at that time for the conduct of our foreign policy were in themselves right, she has in the progress of the last three years become painfully convinced that the manner in which they have been *practically applied* has worked out very different results from those which the correctness of the principles themselves had led her to expect. For when the revolutionary movement on

[1] Greville, *Journal of the Reign of Queen Victoria*, iii. 433.

[2] *Nineveh and its Remains*, which was followed in 1853 by the *Discoveries*.

the Continent had laid prostrate almost all its Governments, and England alone displayed that order, vigour, and prosperity which it owes to a stable, free, and good Government, the Queen, instead of earning the natural good results of such a glorious position, viz. consideration, good will, confidence, and influence abroad, obtained the very reverse, and had the grief to see her Government and herself treated on many occasions with neglect, aversion, distrust, and even contumely.

'Frequently, when our foreign policy was called in question, it has been said by Lord John and his colleagues that the principles on which it was conducted were the right ones, and having been approved of by them, received their support; and that it was only the *personal* manner of Lord Palmerston in conducting the affairs which could be blamed in framing the causes which led to the disastrous effects the Queen complains of.

'The Queen is certainly not disposed to defend the personal manner in which Lord Palmerston has conducted foreign affairs, but she cannot admit that the errors he committed were *merely faults in form and method.* The Queen considers that she has also to complain of what appeared to her *deviations* from the principles laid down by the Cabinet for his conduct; nay, she sees distinctly in their practical application a *personal and arbitrary perversion* of the very nature and essence of those principles.

'She has only to refer here to Italy, Spain, Greece, Holstein, France, &c., which afford ample illustrations of this charge.

'It was one thing for Lord Palmerston to have attempted such substantial deviations. It will be another for the Cabinet to consider whether they had not the power to check him in these attempts.

'The Queen, however, considering times to have now changed, thinks that there is no reason why we should any longer confine ourselves to the mere assertion of abstract principles, such as non-intervention in the internal affairs of other countries, moral support to liberal institutions, protection to British subjects, &c. &c.

'The moving powers which were put in operation by the French Revolution of 1848, and the events consequent on it, are no longer so obscure; they have assumed distinct and tangible forms in almost all the countries affected by them (in France, in Italy, in Germany, &c.), and upon the state of things now existing and the experience gained, the Queen would hope that our foreign policy may be more *specifically defined*, and that it may be considered how the general principles are to be practically adapted to our peculiar relations with each continental State.

'The Queen wishes therefore that a regular programme embracing

these different relations should be submitted to her, and would suggest whether it would not be the best mode if Lord John were to ask Lord Granville to prepare such a paper and to lay it before her after having revised it. This would then serve as a safe guide for Lord Granville, and enable the Queen as well as the Cabinet to see that the policy as in future to be conducted will be in conformity with the principles laid down and approved.'

The Prime Minister did not altogether enjoy the notion.

'I send you a letter from the Queen [he wrote to the new Foreign Secretary in his driest style] which imposes upon you the duty of preparing a programme. I have told H.M. that it is not the policy of this country to make engagements except in a view of the circumstances of the moment, and thus any rule may be broken through—that the best rule after all is to do to others as we wish they should do unto us. Still you may write a sketch of what you conceive our foreign policy should be.'[1]

Lord Granville accordingly replied that in obedience to her Majesty's commands he would endeavour to record, however imperfectly, the views of the Government with respect to British foreign policy, to point out what he conceived to be the proper objects of that policy, the principles of action by which those objects were to be obtained, and the application of those principles to our relations with the principal countries of Europe.[2]

The memorandum which was in consequence drawn up began by stating that in the opinion of the Cabinet it was the duty and the interest of a country such as Great Britain having possessions scattered over the whole globe, and finding itself in an advanced state of civilisation, to encourage progress among all other nations. But for this purpose the foreign policy of Great Britain should be none the less marked by 'justice, moderation, and self-respect,' and avoid any undue attempt to enforce her own ideas by hostile threats. This passage was intended to strike a note distinctly opposed to the overbearing attitude too often assumed by Lord Palmerston. Considering the great

[1] December 29, 1851. See also Greville's *Journal of the Reign of Queen Victoria*, 1837–1852, iii. 442.

[2] Only a draft of this memorandum exists among Lord Granville's papers.

national advantages of foreign commerce, and the powerful means of civilisation it affords, one of the first duties of a British Government, the memorandum proceeded, must always be to obtain for our foreign trade that security which is essential to commercial success; but in aiming at this all considerations of a higher character were not to be roughly pushed aside for the mere sake of supporting British traders abroad in every case and in any undertaking upon which they might have entered at their own risk. An allusion to such cases as those of Don Pacifico was probably here intended, though, as the Prime Minister had made one of his greatest parliamentary efforts in his speech defending Lord Palmerston's championship of that curious client, the allusion had to be discreetly veiled. British subjects of all classes engaged in innocent pursuits abroad were entitled to the protection of their Government. Where they had been treated with injustice, they had a right to expect that redress should be demanded in strong but dignified language, followed if necessary by corresponding measures; but where by their own wanton folly or misconduct they might have got into difficulties, they had no right to expect assistance; and even where they unwittingly but imprudently subjected themselves to the penal laws of the country in which they found themselves, they could not claim more than those good offices the efficacy of which always depends upon the friendliness of our relations with the country in which the difficulty had arisen.

The Memorandum further stated that the Cabinet adhered to non-intervention in the internal affairs of other countries as a principle tending to maintain the dignity of the Crown and the security of the country, and to strengthen the lasting influence of the nation upon the opinion of the world. But they did not attach to the expression 'non-intervention' the meaning implied by some who used it, viz. 'that diplomacy is become obsolete, and that it is unnecessary for this country to know or to take part in what passes in other countries.' With regard to occurrences likely to have international consequences, no general rule, however, could be uniformly applied.

The Government must in each case exercise a wide discretion whether it should interfere at once, or remain aloof till arbitration or good offices were requested. The latter course might often be advisable, when, as was then the case, opinion abroad was in extremes, and the foreign policy of England had obtained, whether justly or unjustly, the reputation of interfering too much. It would also often be found advisable to combine with other Great Powers when no sacrifice of principle was required to settle disputes between other nations.

With respect to the internal affairs of other countries, such as the establishment of liberal institutions and the reduction of tariffs, in which this country has an interest, H.M.'s representatives ought to be furnished with the views of H.M.'s Government on each subject, and the arguments best adapted to support those views; but they should be instructed to press these views only when fitting opportunities occurred, and only when their advice and assistance would be welcome or be effectual, because the intrusion of advice suspected to be not wholly disinterested never could have as much effect as an opinion given at the request of the person who is to be influenced. With the countries which have adopted institutions similar in liberality to our own, it ought to be the endeavour of H.M.'s Government to cultivate the most intimate relations. In this connection the duty of H.M.'s Government should be to keep them informed of everything which might expose them to danger, and to give them, when required, frank and judicious advice; and also to exert its influence to dissuade other Powers from encroaching on their territory or attempting to subvert their institutions. But cases might occur in which the honour and good faith of this country would require that it should support such allies with more than merely friendly assurances.

These principles, the Memorandum concluded by pointing out, required a particular application in each case, for our relations with each of the different European nations and with the United States of America often depended on special

circumstances; and it must be remembered by the Queen that one unforeseen event might, like a move on a chessboard, necessitate counter-arrangements totally different from those originally contemplated.

In this paper, as the 'Lodger' to whom it was shown observed, there was absolutely nothing to which either Lord Aberdeen or even Lord Palmerston himself might not theoretically have subscribed with perfect ease; but, as that great authority also observed, 'in diplomacy *c'est le ton qui fait la chanson*,' and it was not so much Lord Palmerston's acts as his tone which had brought about the recent catastrophe.[1] 'I see every day,' Lord Granville told Lord Clarendon, 'the proofs in the Foreign Office of the extraordinary ability and the little follies of my great predecessor.'[2]

The succession to Lord Palmerston was such as might have daunted a bolder man, whether regarded from the point of view of the position at home or abroad. The most influential sections of public opinion in England, being with Lord Palmerston and against the Court—of which it shocked Lord John Russell's Whig conscience to think he was now charged with being the creature—were prepared to believe the worst of Lord Granville, merely because he replaced the popular favourite; and as Lord Palmerston's long championship of liberty against the Holy Alliance was the basis of his popularity, his comparatively unknown successor—illogical and unjust as the sentiment was—immediately became credited with entertaining exactly opposite sentiments, and with being prepared to act as the minion of the crowned heads of Europe. The fall of the late Foreign Secretary was in fact regarded by a public unacquainted with the peculiar circumstances which had led to it, as a victory for the old diplomacy, and as the triumph of all the forces of absolutism. Lord Granville's liberal antecedents were unknown abroad, and at home they were ignored in the passion of the moment. The British Minister at Madrid, Lord Howden, actually tendered his resignation, oblivious of the sentiments which his

[1] Greville, *Journal of the Reign of Queen Victoria*, 1837–1852, iii. 442, 443.
[2] Lord Granville to Lord Clarendon, January 5, 1852.

new chief had expressed in the debates on the Quadruple Alliance, because his own services, he said,

'could no longer be of any use, as the retirement of Lord Palmerston either actually is or most certainly will be believed to be a direct concession to the reactionary spirit which is riding rough-shod over the world, and which is nowhere more to be apprehended than in Spain.'[1]

The situation was further complicated at the moment by the peculiarities of the British Ambassador in Paris. To Lord Normanby in his long and varied career posterity will not deny the possession of some considerable gifts and accomplishments. In the melancholy list of Irish Viceroys he stands recognised as one of the few who succeeded in favourably impressing the popular imagination. The discernment which he exhibited in the choice of Thomas Drummond as his principal adviser would, even if it stood alone, entitle him to some share of the meed of fame. But the splendid and slightly vainglorious demeanour which had charmed the inhabitants of Dublin did not meet with the same measure of success on the banks of the Seine amid more fastidious surroundings, and unfortunately lent itself to ridicule in a country where ridicule is often fatal. Endless tales were invented. It was declared that long ago the Emperor of Russia had presented the British Ambassador with a sword, and that the British Ambassador had caused it to be reduced to the size of a dagger, and had worn it on his coat in Paris as a decoration at a State ball. 'There was our Ambassador,' a wit had written to England, 'covered with decorations given by himself to himself, and very noble and generous of him too.' 'Il est bon enfant,' M. Guizot was said to have observed, 'mais il ne comprend pas notre langue,'[2] and this imperfect knowledge of the language of the country rendered it possible for unfriendly critics to invent good stories at his expense: to relate for example

[1] Lord Howden to Lord Granville, December 1851. *Life of Palmerston*, iv. 309.

[2] Article in the *Dictionary of National Biography*, xlv. p. 231. The authority for the story is not given.

that he had greatly offended a leading statesman by one badly expressed letter, and then had made matters worse by writing another, in which, desiring to explain that he had made *une méprise*, he had said unwittingly that the former letter was *un mépris*, and that he hoped it would be accepted as such. Such stories were doubtless the gay inventions of ill-disposed persons. But it was beyond question that Lord Normanby wrote despatches of immense length, and that his private letters were, to say the least, as numerous as his despatches were long. The former in Lord Palmerston's opinion were full of irrelevant matter; and if the latter seemed on a first examination to have the merit of being written in an admirable handwriting, they were subsequently discovered on a closer scrutiny to be almost illegible. But it was a far more serious matter that the Ambassador, forgetting that a diplomatist should have no party politics, was unable to conceal his hostility to the new French President, and that the maintenance of cordial relations between the two countries, a task quite sufficiently difficult in itself after the events of December 1851, was further imperilled by his indiscretions.

'I am somewhat puzzled about Normanby [Lord John Russell wrote to his new Foreign Secretary]. On the whole I am disposed to say to him that he has stayed at Paris too long, and that I wish he would place his resignation in my hands.' [1]

Lord Palmerston had shortly before told the Ambassador that one of his despatches, which consisted of a dissertation on Kossuth, 'might have made a good article in the *Times*,' and that another 'was mostly about a broken looking-glass in a club house, and a piece of plaster brought down from the ceiling by musket shots during the recent street fighting;' but that, on the other hand, he seemed to be quite unacquainted with important events which he ought to have reported.[2] Lord Granville had to follow in a similar strain before a month was over.

[1] Lord John Russell to Lord Granville, December 28, 1851.
[2] Lord Palmerston to Lord Normanby, December 6, 1851.

LONDON, *January* 6, 1852.

'MY DEAR NORMANBY,—Your letters are charming, and most useful and instructive, but they are like letters which one might find in an old chest narrating events which appear to be perfectly incompatible with the age in which we live. Still I think our policy is to be well with the President, as long as he retains the immense power which he now wields, without committing ourselves to any approval of his late acts. I was amused with Sallandrouze, who has communicated a letter of mine returning thanks for the Exhibition present to the newspapers. He has omitted the words "Assembly" and "People," which were in the original.

'I am now going to make a most pert request for one who writes such a hand as I do. Your handwriting is beautiful, but I, like Lord Palmerston, cannot read it. Perhaps you will sign the copies, and keep the originals. Do not tell Lady Normanby, or she will never again speak to me for my impertinence, but ask her to send me an answer about Mr. Yorke.

'Yours sincerely, GRANVILLE.'[1]

Although Lord John was always loth to part with an old political ally, it soon became impossible to maintain Lord Normanby any longer at his post; and one evening the readers of the *Globe*, then the habitual recipient of Ministerial confidences, found a *communiqué* in its columns, the terms of which Lord Granville had himself carefully framed, that the Ambassador had resigned.[2] The choice of his successor was unusually important. Lord Canning was the first person to whom Lord Granville made an offer. He had been Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs in the Administration of Lord Aberdeen, to whom, as most nearly representing the traditions of his illustrious father, he had attached himself on entering political life.

LORD GRANVILLE TO LORD CANNING.

LONDON, *January* 20, 1852.

'MY DEAR CANNING,—Lord John has determined soon to accept on general grounds Lord Normanby's resignation. I *know* Lord John thinks you are by far the fittest person to be his successor, and

[1] Lord Granville to Lord Normanby, January 6, 1852.
[2] *Globe*, January 28, 1852.

I believe Lord John would at once agree to any appointment which I proposed, if he did not object to the fitness of the person.

'I, however, cannot propose you to him without having some notion of your being likely to accept; which, with your infernal trick of ever saying "No," is never certain!

'I presume you would not object to a diplomatic appointment as you probably would to a political one at this moment, and I do not think you would feel what many in your position would do with respect to acting with so untried a man as myself at the Foreign Office. You would be working with me and not under me. I need not say what a comfort it would be to me to have you at Paris, and how deeply important it is to the public safety that a good man should be there at this time.

'You will consider this note as strictly confidential between ourselves. 'Ever yours, GRANVILLE.'

LORD CANNING TO LORD GRANVILLE.

WINDSOR, *January* 21, 1852.

'MY DEAR GRANVILLE,—I found your letter in Grosvenor Square this afternoon, as I passed through town from Welbeck; but I had not time to carry you an answer to it in person, which perhaps would have been best.

'Many many thanks for it, although I am afraid the proposal is one to which I can reply without hesitation; for I doubt whether any considerations or any combination of circumstances (I can imagine none) would induce me to take the post in question.

'I quite admit that, in a political and party point of view, there is some difference between an office held abroad and one at home; but the fact is that, apart from any such consideration, the nature of the service would be most distasteful to me; and I know nothing that would compensate this—not even the sense of a duty undertaken—for I do not concur with Lord John and you in your estimate of my fitness.

'However, I am not the less grateful for the proposal which it has moved you to make.

'Ever yours sincerely, CANNING.

'I do not think there is much chance of your supposing that I am foolish enough to be influenced by the motive you allude to as regards yourself; so I do not waste words disclaiming it.'

The Embassy after Lord Canning's refusal having been offered to and refused by Lord Clanricarde, was accepted by Lord Cowley, then Minister to the Germanic Confederation

at Frankfurt. He continued to hold the post till 1867, and Lord Granville used to say that of the numerous diplomatic appointments which he had made during his successive tenures of the Foreign Office, there was none to which he felt he could look back with such unalloyed satisfaction as that which he made to Paris during his brief reign in Downing Street in 1852.

If the difficulties caused by the idiosyncrasies of Lord Normanby were considerable, far more serious were the troubles which were arising from the inexperience of the representative of France in London, M. Walewski, who was regarded, especially in Whig circles, with dislike and suspicion. Charles Greville, probably reflecting the current opinion, described him a few years after these events in exaggerated language as 'an adventurer, a needy speculator, without honour, conscience, or truth, and utterly unfit both as to character and capacity for high office of any kind.'[1] It was not necessary to accept all these statements as true in order to realise that M. Walewski was not only showing that his recent and sudden elevation to a prominent position in the diplomatic firmament had turned his head, but that he was by nature a *marplot*: a misfortune all the greater because his chief M. Turgot was equally unfit, by the confession of his own friends, for the direction of the Foreign Office, to which he had unexpectedly been called by the events of December 1851. The political atmosphere was full of rumours, excursions and alarums. There had already been reports credited by responsible persons, about the time of the *coup d'état*, when war in Germany between Austria and Prussia seemed more than probable and an opportunity for a *coup de main* seemed favourable, to the effect that the Prince President had sent for General Changarnier, and had asked him to form an army in the shortest possible time, as the proper moment had now arrived to strike a blow against Rhenish Prussia.[2] The General had fortunately answered, 'No, an attack of that sort

[1] Greville, *Journal of the Reign of Queen Victoria*, 1852–1860, p. 7.

[2] Baron Stockmar to Lord Granville, February 19, 1852.

could not be made without the most serious preparations for it; and a hasty and inconsiderate movement might bring incalculable danger upon France,' advice which possibly may have been remembered by the General and Napoleon III. in 1870, when at an interval of nearly twenty years the irony of fortune again brought them together for a moment at Metz in the last days of the Empire, just in time for General Changarnier himself to be involved in the capitulation of the army of Marshal Bazaine.[1]

At the moment the Prince President was believed to be aiming at an understanding with Austria, then at the very height of her unpopularity in England. Metternich had fallen, but only to be succeeded by Prince Felix Schwarzenberg and Baron Bach. The Vienna Revolution, which in its origin had been a movement of the middle classes to obtain a moderate amount of constitutional freedom, had been crushed in blood and massacre. Simultaneously the surrender of Görgei's army at Vilagos had terminated the struggle in Hungary. By the bloody reprisals exercised against Count Louis Batthyany and the aristocratic leaders, many of the greatest families in England had lost personal friends, and a Whig could recognise the probable fate of his own political ancestors had the Revolution of 1688 been put down by the Stuarts. The reaction and the system of repression which followed made the working classes of England boil over with enthusiasm for Kossuth and demonstrate against General Haynau when he visited London. By responsible statesmen it was also remembered that Austria, in violation of the Treaty of Vienna, had aided Russia in crushing Poland, and had herself suppressed the Free Republic of Krakau; that Austria was now trying to push Prussia still further into the path of reaction; that Austria was believed to have been uniformly hostile to Greek independence, and that it was an Austrian army which was encamped on the soil of Italy. Every class, every section of opinion in England, was thus united in a common hatred. But so far as it was possible to get any clue to the ideas of

[1] Comte d'Antioche, *Vie du Général Changarnier*, p. 435.

M. Walewski, he appears to have desired at this juncture above all things to form an *entente* between France and Austria, based on a recognition by France of the Austrian position in Italy, and the support by France of Austrian preponderance in Germany against Prussia. He thereby proposed to secure Austrian support to French demands on Belgium, Switzerland, and Sardinia, in regard to the extradition of the political refugees in those countries, demands which might lead up at the proper moment to the revival of old boundary questions, Prussia being, it was hoped, amenable to influence in the shape of support to her claims on Neufchâtel.

'The general view [Baron Stockmar wrote to Lord Granville] which I take at present with regard to what England has to apprehend of France, is comprised in the following unconnected sentences.

'France was peaceful from 1815 to 1848, because she was during that time *tant bien que mal* constitutionally governed. There can be no doubt that the French themselves acquired a more peaceful disposition than they had shown heretofore. It is feared that the more peaceable disposition will disappear with the extinction of constitutional government, and with the reintroduction of the *Régime Impériale*. Napoleon's system in foreign affairs was *La France et la violence*. This system the nephew believes himself to be predestined to revive. But even if this was not his creed, the force of circumstances, which domineers him, would constrain him to do it.

'Of the hundred and one things out of which the old Imperial system was made up, the nephew will attempt to re-establish the one or the other, at one time or at another, just as opportunities offer and promise a hope of success. In these attempts he will as often desist as he encounters obstacles which threaten his own position; but he will begin again as often as circumstances inspire him with fresh hope.

'With regard to the attempts on the present territorial *status quo* of Europe, the only check really operative on the President and the French will be the conviction in their minds that *l'Europe unie s'opposera à tout envahissement*. France at this moment is over-rich in men; and, horses excepted, they are well provided with all the material for war. The Bank possesses 500,000,000 francs in cash. To exchange these against a *reçu* will not be difficult for the President.'[1]

[1] Baron Stockmar to Lord Granville, February 19, 1852.

Count Bismarck, then Prussian Minister to the Diet at Frankfurt, informed the British Chargé d'Affaires that great uneasiness, in which he himself participated, existed in Berlin at the *rapprochement* of Austria and France: in confirmation of which he read to him a private letter stating that overtures had been made in Paris from Vienna to overthrow constitutional government in Sardinia and Belgium, and Radicalism in Switzerland: that this was an adventurous policy which would suit Prince Schwarzenberg; and that Austria, not stopping there, would probably commit some act of aggression against Prussia, and that Prussia would be swamped before a Russian army could come to their assistance. The letter went on to say that such was likewise the opinion of Baron Meyendorf, the Russian Ambassador at Vienna. Count Bismarck moreover informed the British Chargé d'Affaires that the pecuniary claims which it was said were now about to be brought forward by France against Belgium were made at the instigation of Austria in order to find a *casus belli*.[1]

Meanwhile the French Ambassador at St. James's had gone out of his way to tell Lord Cowley, who at the moment was still in England, that he would find his position as Ambassador at Paris very delicate, and that 'much would depend on what would be said at the meeting of Parliament by the members of the Government; and that any expression of disapproval of the President's conduct by Lord John Russell or by Lord Granville would have the most serious effect;' and he also complained bitterly of the language of the press, especially that of the *Times*, in regard to the Prince President.[2] He admitted, however, that Austria had proposed to France a joint military occupation of Switzerland, though France, he said, had declined it, contenting herself for the present with a note couched in very strong terms on the subject of the political refugees. He introduced the subject of the claims of the King of Prussia on

[1] Mr. Edwardes to Lord Granville, January 1852. These claims were in regard to certain payments for the expenses of the siege of Antwerp.

[2] Lord Cowley to Lord Granville, January 30, 1852.

Neufchâtel, apparently as an additional shaft in his arsenal and as affording a possible inducement to Prussia to act with Austria and France ; and a few days afterwards, with singular indiscretion, in an interview at Windsor, he inquired as to the rumours of military preparations in England, and asked if it were true that the Duke of Wellington had been conferred with on the subject.[1] Meanwhile, to make the situation still more delicate, the press, led by the *Times*, broke out against the Prince President in a furious campaign.

'I entirely agree with you [Lord Granville wrote to Lord Clarendon] about the press here on the subject of France. It is the height of folly irritating a man who has not only the executive power, but holds by proxy the Constituent and Legislative votes of the whole country at his disposal. The body of the French people will not long bear with fortitude this sort of dictation from their neighbours *d'outre-mer*. Some think that the President is certain to be shot: others that he is killing himself.'[2]

Lord Granville now advised the Prime Minister that a consultation should be held with Count Flahault, who he thought was more likely to know the mind of the Prince President than M. Walewski, and in any case was more likely to be able to influence him. Count Flahault was the son of a French nobleman of the constitutional party, who, like so many persons of moderate opinions, had fallen by the guillotine at Arras during the reign of terror inaugurated there by the ex-monk Jean-Jacques Lebon in 1793. His widow, the authoress of *Adèle de Sénanges*, better known under the name of Madame de Souza, which she acquired by her second marriage, escaped from Paris through the aid of the American Minister Gouverneur Morris, and fled almost destitute to England, the ports of which were open to aliens. Her son was educated at an English school. Joining the French army at the age of sixteen, in the campaign which ended at Marengo, M. de Flahault rapidly distinguished himself, rose in the subsequent campaigns to the rank of general of division, and was appointed aide-de-camp to the

[1] Memoranda of conversations between Lord Granville and M. Walewski, January 1852.

[2] Lord Granville to Lord Clarendon, January 7, 1852.

Emperor, serving in that capacity through the campaigns of 1812, 1813, and 1814. After the capture of Paris he retired from active service, and, unlike many of the other generals of the Empire, did not accept office or place under the Restoration. On the return from Elba, he at once rejoined the Emperor, and took a considerable part in the organisation of the army which fought at Waterloo. Remaining to the last on the field of battle, he left only when the rout was complete, and rode by the side of the Emperor to Charleroi. An offer he made to accompany the Emperor to St. Helena was declined on the ground that he was too young a man to have his career spoilt. Finding himself the object of the pronounced hostility of the Legitimist party, both on account of his liberal opinions and his attachment to the Empire, he took refuge in Switzerland and subsequently in England, where he had married Miss Mercer of Aldie, daughter and heiress of Lord Keith, the famous admiral, the rival of Nelson and the captor of the Cape from the Dutch. On the fall of Charles X. Count Flahault was at length able to return to France, and accepted service under the Monarchy of July. He became successively Ambassador at Berlin and Vienna, and was more than once spoken of as a possible Foreign Minister. After the fall of Louis Philippe he had again settled in England, but since the practical return of the Bonapartist party to power after the *coup d'état*, of which he was probably cognisant, he had renewed relations with the Government of France. His daughter was married to the son and heir of Lord Lansdowne, then President of the Council, and personally and politically he was always a welcome guest in the houses of the chief supporters of the Ministry. His eventful and chequered career had made him essentially the most international man of the day, and he seemed marked out to be the natural mediator between the angry passions and suspicions of the two countries, in each of which he was equally at home.[1]

[1] *Le Général Comte de Flahault: une Rectification* (Paris: Dubuisson et Cie, 1881). This book was written in reply to some insinuations contained in the *Life of Marshal Davoust*, who never forgave M. de Flahault for his interference with some proposals of his in 1815 when Minister for War during the Waterloo campaign.

A rupture in 1852 was clearly within the limit of the possibilities of the immediate future. 'I should not like to begin with a European war,' [1] Lord Granville wrote to Lord Lansdowne, in invoking his aid to communicate with M. de Flahault; and in a long letter to Lord John Russell written on the last day of the year he described the dangers of the situation as a whole.

LONDON, *December* 31, 1851.

'MY DEAR LORD JOHN,—The Corps Diplomatique were, as in duty bound, very civil yesterday. Austria, Prussia, and Bavaria tried to convey to me that they were *not* making use of formal phrases; but I looked stupid, which I find to be one of the easiest tasks connected with the F.O.

'Van de Weyer spoke to me on an important subject. He read me a private letter from the King, in which H.M. expressed great alarm at the designs of the Government of France with respect to Belgium, and of their intention to renew the French claims for expenses at Antwerp.

'Van de Weyer said that a communication from the British Government made confidentially to the French Government would have the best effect, particularly if given in time; that Lord Palmerston had in 1848 told the Provisional Government that, with regard to Belgium, H.M.'s Government were not only bound by treaty and political ties, but also by a special guarantee, and for these reasons would not bear with indifference an encroachment upon the independence of Belgium.

'I told M. Van de Weyer that my own opinion was in favour of Louis Napoleon intending to effect great changes in France, and that he would be averse to going to war, his own interest being obviously against such a course; but I added confidentially that I had in a private letter heard from Normanby, that he thought he perceived vague notions of *remaniement de territoire* floating in the brain of the President.

'This morning Van de Weyer came to me again, and read me a despatch from the Belgian Minister at Berlin, who had been confidentially informed by Baron Manteuffel that overtures had been made to the three Courts to join with France in insisting upon the payment of these claims; that Prussia, whatever she might have done a short time ago, would not join now, but that one (whom he would not mention) of the other two Courts did not hold this view.

'He again alluded to Lord Palmerston's communication. I said

[1] Lord Granville to Lord Lansdowne, December 30, 1851.

I had looked last night over all the despatches of 1848, and had found nothing so strong as he mentioned. He said he was sure of it, but does not know in what form the message was conveyed. (My private secretary tells me he thinks he remembers something of the sort in a private letter to Normanby.) I told him that I could not, of course, without consultation with my colleagues, commit the Government in any way; but as an individual I was sure they would be anxious to give the strongest support to Belgium in case of any attempt upon her independence. He stated that the advice to his own Government had always been, if the Antwerp claims were pressed, to say, "We have nothing to do with them, they must be discussed in London;" that he lately told Lord Palmerston so, who had said, "C'est très bien, et s'ils viennent nous les rembourserons bien." He is to see me before his own departure for Paris.

'You will have seen in the papers the phrase quoted from the *Moniteur* that "Strasbourg would remain in the same military division *as long as the frontiers were the same.*" All this makes the foreign policy of France a matter of anxiety to us. I do not think we could send a special message about Belgium without including Sardinia, where the same alarm exists. Switzerland and the Rhine are points not so vital, but which are still of great importance.

'We have now no good grounds for addressing the President as to the plans of foreign aggression. He has through Count Walewski already given assurances of peaceful intentions. These assurances he will again repeat, and they will not restrain him, if he thinks a decided move would be to his advantage.

'If I sent a private message through Normanby, I am afraid the channel would make it irritating. I should like to sound the Ministers of the three Courts, but in so delicate a matter I wish for your immediate advice.

'I will send a copy of this note to Bowood in case Flahault is still there, and that Lord Lansdowne can extract from him what are the real intentions of the President.

'Van de Weyer is going to Windsor. Perhaps you would like to send this note to H.M.

'Yours truly,

'GRANVILLE.'

LORD JOHN RUSSELL TO LORD GRANVILLE.

December 31, 1851.

'MY DEAR GRANVILLE,—I think it will not do to write to Normanby, and it will be useless to speak to Walewski.

'The best course, I think, will be to write to Bowood and ask

Flahault to come up. He has great influence, and I believe he really wishes for a good understanding between the two countries.

'The President's assurances are hardly to be trusted, but I think he has no interest in going to war. The Belgians must be defended by us and by Prussia. I do not remember the case of the *remboursement*.

'You may communicate with Brunnow very freely, less so with Austria.

'Belgium is threatened by France—Piedmont by Austria. Walewski here and the French Minister at Turin both say France will defend the independence of Piedmont.

'I repeat you had better send for Flahault, and ask him to go to Paris. Tell him we have at heart the independence of Belgium and of Piedmont, and ask him to ascertain the President's sentiments with regard to those two countries.

'It is probable the President wishes to have some cry for the next elections, and he will be glad to make it appear that he is increasing French territory, though without actually doing it.

'I have not sent your letter to the Queen, but you may send it with this.

'Yours truly,

'J. Russell.'

Lord Lansdowne to Lord Granville.

Bowood, *January* 1, 1852.

'My dear Granville,—I received your note inclosing a copy of your letter to Lord John by the post this morning, since which the messenger has brought me your box. I think it very desirable that you should see Flahault and talk these matters over with him; but as he was going *naturally* to London on Saturday, I have given him the shorter of your notes, and he desires me to say that he will call upon you in Bruton Street, at 3 o'clock or a little after on Saturday afternoon, unless he should hear from you that it will be more convenient to you to see him elsewhere. I am strongly inclined to think with you, that it is the President's wish to keep well with England, and also that it is his present expectation that he will be able to do so; but at the same time anything which ultimately appears to be necessary to enable him to fulfil his destiny, i.e. his wish to remain ruler of France, will prove irresistible to him. It appears to me very important that in any communication, direct or indirect, that may be made to the French Government, founded on apprehensions respecting Belgium, Piedmont should be included; otherwise they would be sure to infer that the former was the only object about which we really cared, and that they had *carte blanche* as to the latter.

'Flahault abounds in assurances of expressions of his own strong conviction, that nothing is intended with respect to any other Power, but what is essential to their own internal safety; but this may admit of a large construction. 'Yours sincerely,

'LANSDOWNE.'

On January 3 the interview took place of which the record will be found in the following memorandum.

MEMORANDUM OF AN INTERVIEW BETWEEN M. DE FLAHAULT AND LORD GRANVILLE.

January 3, 1852.

'I called on M. de Flahault this evening. I said that I wished to speak to him, because I believed he would be frank with me; that he was anxious for a good understanding between the two countries of England and France; and that, as he had no official position, I could broach subjects with him which I could not do through Normanby or Walewski. I said that I felt no alarm, but that there were vague rumours of odd phrases in the *Moniteur* about the frontiers, demands upon Belgium for Antwerp indemnity, &c., &c., which made me anxious to hear what he really thought and knew of the President's intentions. He spoke to me with a frankness which convinced me he was saying at least what he believed to be true. He does not think there is the least danger of the President going beyond his boundaries. He thinks this from what the President had said to him in moments of unreserved communication, from his confidence in the President's judgment as to what is advantageous to himself, and from the difficulties that would beset him if he attempted to make war. He thinks it unwise at this moment for the French to move about the French claims on Belgium; but as for attacking Belgium, he holds it to be out of the question that a nephew of Napoleon, who had studied his uncle's history, should run his head against all the Great Powers, and break a guarantee to which France herself had subscribed. That with respect to the Rhine, the President could not command the army, and that he would not entrust the command to any of the African generals, or even those who are now attached to his person. He gave me some curious proofs of how little anxious the French people, or even the army, were for war; among them that, in 1840, when war was supposed to be imminent, and the number of volunteers for conscription was expected to be double, only one half of the usual number came forward. He added that Switzerland and Sardinia were in a different position; that the French would not interfere with the internal government of these States, but he thought would insist that the refugees who were

planning insurrection in their sanctuaries close to their own frontiers should be removed, and that he (Flahault) thought they had a right to prevent their house being set on fire.

'I begged him to remember and remind those over whom he had influence how excitable the people of this country were about Switzerland and still more about Sardinia. He said he knew it, and that he regretted that M. Turgot was still at the Foreign Office, he being a good man, but from inexperience wanting *dans les formes*—that this place would soon be changed. He showed me the copies made by his daughter of his own private letters. They were very sensible, giving an exact account of what had passed here, and tendering most excellent advice to the President.

'I asked him what he thought of Austria and Sardinia. He ridiculed the notion of the former doing anything more than trying to alarm the Sardinians into certain concessions. That although Prince Schwarzenberg was obstinate and rash, he could not drag the bureaucracy with him, and that the French would never allow the Austrians to put their feet into Sardinia. As for a joint occupation, he believed that whatever party made the proposal first would be looked upon with great jealousy by the other. I thought this conversation very reassuring. I do not believe he tried to deceive me, or that he deceived himself.

'He showed me, but this was in strict confidence, the very amiable letter he had written, dissuading the President from sending him or anyone else to announce the result of his election to her Majesty.'

Lord Cowley's first letter from Paris had meanwhile indicated the danger arising from the language of the English newspapers.

'One remark fell from the President this morning [he wrote on February 20] which I will not mention in any public despatch, but which you ought to know. We were talking mutually of the desires of the two Governments to live at peace with each other. "There is nothing," he said, "which can prevent it, but the proceedings of your press. If a rupture was to arise on account of its violence, the fault would be with half a dozen individuals." He probably had an eye to the future in saying this.'[1]

Lord Granville had already conveyed his own anxieties to the Prime Minister on the subject. In order to deal with the *Times*—almost as formidable a task in 1852 as that of

[1] Lord Cowley to Lord Granville, February 20, 1852.

dealing with the French President—Lord Granville determined to take advantage of his intimate personal relations with Mr. Henry Reeve, then so powerful in the councils of that paper, and to risk a private appeal through him to Printing House Square. The appeal was received in a friendly spirit, and Mr. Reeve's reply led to a further letter in which Lord Granville illustrated the difficulties of his own position by a little parable.

LORD GRANVILLE TO MR. HENRY REEVE.

BRUTON STREET, *January* 19, 1852.

'MY DEAR REEVE,—I will, as Lord Overstone does in examining a witness, suppose a case.

'I am the servant of an old bachelor. My master likes to have everything well conducted about his own house, and those of his neighbours, but he abhors expense or any disturbance of his ease and comfort. He desires me to take charge of his house, which like other houses in our square is surrounded by inflammable materials.

'A strong energetic schoolboy, vain, irritable, without principle and latterly much spoilt, walks about the square with a lighted candle, which has been given to him by those in authority over him, and which I have no right and am not strong enough to take away from him, until after he has made a bad use of it. A fellow-servant of mine, very influential with my master, in mild and dignified language, in every word of which I agree, complains every morning to the schoolboy, that he is an unmitigated little scamp, who deserves to be well whipped. I, who have no right to quarrel with my fellow-servant for holding language which I know to be true and which may moreover have a salutary effect on the teaboys of our own and our neighbour's establishments, cannot help fearing that the schoolboy, in his anger, may set fire to some of my neighbour's houses, and that I shall have, to the infinite annoyance of my master, to put it out.

'I have no doubt what the *Times* says is right, and that it is justified in saying it, but I cannot help rejoicing that you will do what you can to soften the tone of it. 'Ever yours,

'GRANVILLE.'

'Your parable [Mr. Reeve replied] is most ingenious, but illustrates your position: not ours. You have to deal exclusively with a *de facto* Government, and to accept it as the representative of the French people. You have to consider its acts only as regards England

and English interests; and so long as it maintained relations with us, you would not be justified in remonstrating, even if a real Reign of Terror after the old pattern were restored, and one hundred heads a day were falling. But this is not our case at all. So far as we write for France, we address ourselves to her people, who we believe not to have forgotten in a week of panic all the lessons of liberty it has been learning in sixty years of agitation. Our readers, however, are almost exclusively English, and having always tried to teach them that the extension of English institutions abroad was desirable for English interests, and that the thing most to be feared was military despotism, we cannot with French facility *accept the situation* and remain silent, when we see all that we have been advocating ever since the peace overthrown.

'We are both equally anxious to preserve the peace, but we cannot do so by your means. However, I will try and make ours as effective as I can, and endeavour to avoid what are called "irritating topics," though how a people that can tolerate Louis Napoleon can be "irritated" by anything we can write I cannot imagine.'[1]

It was the wish of Lord Granville—following in this the example of Lord Palmerston—to establish confidential relations with the principal Ministers abroad by private letters, and not to depend too much on despatches alone.

'If the freemasonry of Grillion's [he wrote to Sir Stratford Canning] was not sufficient, the connection between my father and your cousin, and the respect I have for one who has for so long a time held such a distinguished position as yourself, make me very happy in beginning a private correspondence with you. I am afraid our English political feelings are wide apart; but although this may, together with the necessity of choosing a man who could repair immediately to his post, have influenced her Majesty's Government in not offering the Paris Embassy to you, I hope it will be no bar to your writing to me most openly upon all questions of foreign affairs, and any points which affect your personal comfort.'

To these friendly overtures the great Ambassador replied from Constantinople.

CONSTANTINOPLE, *March* 4, 1852.

'MY DEAR LORD GRANVILLE,—The kind remembrances with which you have opened a private correspondence with me, must naturally influence the spirit of my reply. I trust, indeed, that a

[1] Mr. Reeve to Lord Granville, 1852 (undated).

letter of mine, which crossed yours on the way, will have served to show already that I am not insensible to such recollections. I should perhaps have been better pleased if circumstances had allowed you to give me the *option* of going to Paris, though rather in a diplomatic than a personal point of view.

'Whatever may be the degree of difference between us on matters of home policy, I willingly accept your offer of confidence on foreign questions; and depend upon it that while we stand in our present relations towards each other, I shall write to you respecting them as I wrote in days of yore to your father's friend.

'I beg you will believe me very sincerely yours,

'STRATFORD CANNING.'

Before, however, Sir Stratford Canning's letter could reach London, whatever chance Lord Granville might have had of officially profiting by his experience, in regard to either the affairs of the East or the critical situation nearer home, was gone; for his own connection with the Foreign Office had already been severed. On February 21 Lord Palmerston had his 'tit for tat with John Russell,' and defeated the Government in a division in the House of Commons on the Bill for reorganising the militia. 'We cannot go on any longer,' the Prime Minister wrote to the Foreign Secretary from the House of Commons the same night. Next day the Government resigned.[1]

A stormy incident enlivened the last days of Lord Granville's tenure of the Foreign Office. Before Lord Palmerston left Downing Street, representations had already been made to the Government by the Ambassadors of Austria, France, Prussia, Russia, and the envoy of the Germanic Confederation, on the subject of the proceedings of the foreign refugees resident in England. The question was fortunately not complicated by the difficulties which arose at a later time, when the complaint was, not that a mere political conspiracy but that ordinary crimes were being organised on British soil. The proceedings which were now the subject of the notes of the Ambassadors were the meetings of revolutionary committees, the publication by them of a newspaper, and the attempt to maintain an

[1] Lord John Russell to Lord Granville, February 21, 1852.

organisation on British soil. In 1848 the British Government had itself obtained special powers by statute in Ireland, and under those powers had arrested and sent back various persons suspected of hostile intentions who had arrived from America. Taking advantage of this, Count Buol suggested that similar powers should be obtained in regard to the foreign refugees arriving in Great Britain from the Continent, and threatened that if this were not done, his Government might be obliged to take special measures in regard to persons arriving from England, by which ordinary travellers would be the first to suffer.

On January 13, Lord Granville addressed a circular despatch to the British Ministers abroad on the whole question. He acknowledged the precedent quoted in regard to Ireland to be good as far as it went, but only in so far as it might justify the action of the continental Governments in taking precautionary measures within their own jurisdiction against foreign arrivals if they chose so to do; but not as justifying the application of the Act of 1848 by her Majesty's Government to England. It was no doubt true that measures in the form of Alien Acts had been passed at different times by which the power of expelling foreigners in case of necessity had been conferred on the Executive; but such powers, even when asked for by the Government of the day for the maintenance of internal tranquillity, had always been justly regarded by the British nation with feelings of most extreme jealousy.

'The general hospitality extended by our institutions to all who come to England [the despatch proceeded] has from time to time been the means of affording a secure asylum to political refugees of all parties, many of them illustrious in rank and position. Among them may be mentioned kings and princes of the two branches of the Bourbon family and the Prime Ministers of France and Austria. It is obvious that this hospitality could not be so freely given if it were not so widely extended. If a discretionary power were vested in the Crown, appeals would be constantly made by the dominant party in foreign countries for the expulsion of their political opponents, who might have taken refuge in Great Britain. Monarchical governments might object to republican refugees; and republican governments to royalist

refugees; and it would be difficult to defend such hospitality, which would then be founded upon favour and not upon equal laws. . . . It is the earnest wish of her Majesty's Government to promote, as far as is in their power, the peace, order, and prosperity, of every country with which they are in friendly alliance, but they do not think that any ground exists which would justify them on the present occasion in applying to the Legislature for any extraordinary or future powers in reference to foreigners resident in England; and they have no reason to doubt that this opinion is shared both by the Parliament and the public of the country.' [1]

On February 4, Prince Schwarzenberg replied in a despatch to the Austrian Ambassador couched in a very hostile tone, and published in the newspapers of Vienna before it had reached the Foreign Office. It concluded by announcing special measures with reference to arrivals from England. The controversy was not terminated when the change of Ministry took place.[2] Meanwhile on January 7, 1852, Count Buol, the Austrian Ambassador, had sent a note to the Foreign Office containing a remonstrance from the Duke of Modena, but addressed to the Austrian Government, in regard to the action of the political refugees in England. Lord Granville thereupon informed Count Buol that he could not receive an official communication from the Duke of Modena through a foreign diplomatist not accredited by the Duke himself to the Court of St. James's; and that, while anxious to do whatever was most courteous by Count Buol and by the Government of Austria, he was nevertheless obliged, for reasons which the Ambassador would no doubt understand, to take no notice of the communication. In other words, the British Government declined to recognise the hegemony of Austria in Italy. Undeterred by this rebuff, Count Buol on the 21st returned to the charge. On the day before the fall of the Ministry, he communicated another note almost identical with that from the Duke of Modena and addressed to the Austrian Government by Cardinal Antonelli, on behalf of the Papal Government. A decided step now seemed necessary to Lord Granville, and

[1] *State Papers*, 1852, xlii. 421–423. [2] *Ibid.* xlii. 428.

on the 23rd he addressed a communication to Count Buol which ended by informing him that, under the circumstances, he had no choice but to return both the Modenese and the Roman note to him at the Austrian Embassy.[1] Count Buol did not conceal his wrath. The wildest stories were put about in Vienna and travelled thence to London. Lord Granville, it was declared, had thrown the Papal note back to the Ambassador; Lord Granville had left the room throwing the note behind him, leaving the Ambassador to pick it up off the floor; Lord Granville had left the room saying that as he was not intending to return there, the Ambassador could do what he liked with the note, because he certainly was not going to keep it himself; and so on and so on. Although Lord Malmesbury had succeeded Lord Granville as Minister for Foreign Affairs, the Queen desired to know what had really passed, and by her direction the Prince Consort wrote to Lord Granville.

THE PRINCE CONSORT TO LORD GRANVILLE.

OSBORNE, *March* 9, 1852.

'MY DEAR LORD GRANVILLE,—Your return of the last notes to Count Buol causes a great deal of noise in the world. The Austrians call it an insult, and say that they had not delivered a note from the Pope to the Queen's Government, but one from Antonelli to the Austrian Government, asking for its good offices in the refugee question, that this had been a perfectly regular proceeding, and if it had displeased the British Government they might have confidentially obtained the withdrawal of the note.

'The present Government complain that so important a step as the sending back the notes should have been taken when *virtually*, though not formally, the late Cabinet was out of office. I cannot say that I much attended to the question at the time, when our hands and heads were quite full of the manifold matters connected with the change of Government and the formation of a new Administration and Court.

'Now it would be of importance to me, however, to know the motives which led you to take that particular line at that particular moment. You may rely upon my not repeating to anybody what

[1] Lord Granville to Count Buol, February 23, 1852. *State Papers for* 1852, xlii. 433.

you might not wish to be generally known; but a correct appreciation of the transaction is of the greatest importance in the consideration of our future steps in the quarrels with Austria, which are by no means at an end.

'Ever yours truly,

'ALBERT.'

LORD GRANVILLE TO THE PRINCE CONSORT.

LONDON, *March* 10, 1852.

'SIR,—I have the honour to acknowledge with great respect the receipt of your Royal Highness's letter of the 9th on my return to town this evening.

'The following are the motives which induced me during the interregnum to return to Count Buol his Modenese and Roman communications.

'Lord John on Friday the 20th announced his intended resignation. Count Buol's letter inclosing the communication from the Papal Government was dated on Saturday the 21st, and received at the Foreign Office on the Monday following. It did not, therefore, arrive as other despatches did, accidentally during the interregnum. I did not think it right to return it to the office without any remark for the probable chance of its being altogether overlooked. If I had marked on it, as I did on some other despatches which arrived during the interregnum, that it should be reserved for Lord Malmesbury's consideration, I should have bequeathed to my successor an additional cause of quarrel, and I should have placed both him and myself in a false position; for if he had remonstrated with Count Buol, as I think it would have been his duty to do, Count Buol would have answered his remonstrance by referring to the precedent of my receiving the Modenese communication.

'It appears to me that, far from increasing the difficulties of the present Government, I relieved them from considerable embarrassment by the course which I adopted.

'With regard to the Austrians, I do not think that the return of the notes was an insult or anything but what was demanded by the circumstances of the case. On the reception of the Modenese communication in January it appeared to me an unusual step. I sent a query into the office to know whether it had been customary for the Austrian Minister officially to present such remonstrances from Powers by whom he was not accredited. I was informed that such was not the case. I wrote two drafts of answer to Count Buol, but being at that time in hopes that the tone of my communications with him would put the relations of the two countries on a more friendly footing, I decided upon taking the course recorded in my

last letter to Count Buol; but when my hopes were proved to be groundless, and when Count Buol, encouraged probably by the little notice which I had taken of the Modenese letter, sent in a similar communication from the Papal Government, at a time when it could have no practical end or conciliatory purpose, I thought I was bound to take a stronger step than that which I had adopted in the former case.

'I should not be perfectly frank with your Royal Highness if I did not say that another consideration had had some weight with me. When H.M. Government presented to Parliament the refugee notes, and the circular despatch in reply, it was done because such a publication is usual in this country, and because as we thought that that reply was couched in courteous and moderate language, it would have a conciliatory effect both here and abroad. Prince Schwarzenberg's answer was not calculated to have that effect. I thought, however, that it was expedient not to prolong this recriminatory correspondence, particularly as the Austrians, however illogical the reasons given might be, have an undoubted right to do that which they threatened. I therefore told Count Buol, when he read this despatch to me, that I refrained from discussing it, although it was tempting to do so (or words to that effect), and I resolved not to present it to Parliament until I was obliged to do so, by which time I hoped some antidote might be found to be presented at the same time. Lord John, however, had some doubts about the policy of leaving this despatch unanswered, and when Prince Schwarzenberg adopted with no very friendly feelings the course unusual at Vienna of publishing his rejoinder in the Austrian papers, I was not sorry to avail myself of an opportunity gratuitously offered by Count Buol to notice, without, however, giving a formal answer to Prince Schwarzenberg's despatch, the offensive tone of Prince Schwarzenberg's despatch, and to point out the different manner in which all the other Powers had met our reply.

'In the middle of the week, I stated to Count Buol in conversation that I hoped that the change of Government would enable him to do that which I believed he desired, viz. to put the relations of the two countries on a more sound and friendly footing; that it had been my wish to contribute to this work, but that I had certainly not been assisted by the Austrian Government; and I then expressed my regret that my last act was necessarily one which was of a nature which might be disagreeable to him. I told him the contents of the letter which he would receive from me. He was much put out, but made no suggestion at the time. The next day he proposed to me that I should send the letter privately and not

officially, but I wrote to him that it was too late, as it was sealed and sent, and besides that Lord John, who had approved of the letter, had already taken leave of the Queen.

'I may add that, upon your Royal Highness's suggestion some weeks ago, I saw Lord Burghersh on the subject of the secret agreement between the Russian and Prussian Governments, and I had some communication with him on our relations with Austria.[1] He has since then entirely approved of my conduct with respect to the Roman and Modenese communications, and has this afternoon sent me a message to the effect that he is convinced by his letters from Vienna that it was a *parti pris* there not to make up with us as long as the Whig Ministry remained in power.

'I have the honour to be, with great respect, your Royal Highness's obedient servant, 'GRANVILLE.'

THE PRINCE CONSORT TO LORD GRANVILLE.

OSBORNE, *March* 13, 1852.

'MY DEAR LORD GRANVILLE,—Many thanks for your letter. Your explanation of the circumstances under which the last note to Count Buol was written is quite satisfactory. The Austrians mean now to become friends all on a sudden, under the supposition that the Derby Government will aid them and Louis Napoleon *à combattre l'anarchie et à défendre l'ordre.* They have really little knowledge of England. 'Ever yours truly,

'ALBERT.'

Whatever complaints Lord Derby may have made to the Prince Consort, Lord Malmesbury endorsed the action of his predecessor. He relates himself how, on his entry on his new duties, Count Buol was still 'raving against England and Lord Granville,' and at their first interview 'behaved in the most coarse and insolent manner,' when he, like Lord Granville, refused to receive the notes which were again presented. He at last was obliged to ask 'if the Ambassador was accustomed to speak to English Ministers in that style,' because he must tell him at once that he would not bear it, and should inform the Court of his violence. Count Buol then left the room.'[2]

[1] The Earl of Westmorland, Ambassador to the Court of Berlin, 1841–1851, is here referred to under his earlier title. He had just been appointed to Vienna.

[2] *Memoirs of an Ex-Minister*, i. 321, ed. 1884.

LORD GRANVILLE TO LORD MALMESBURY.

WALMER CASTLE, DEAL, *September* 27, 1884.

'DEAR MALMESBURY,—I look forward to reading your memoirs with great interest and pleasure.

'I see in the review which appeared in the *Times* of yesterday that you refer to an incident which happened more than thirty-two years ago, and in which it seems we both had a share.

'I was not before aware that the Government of which you were a member had completely endorsed my action.

'Your short statement, however, hardly explains our justification.

'Strong remonstrances had been addressed to Lord Palmerston by France, Austria, Germany, Prussia, Russia, and Naples on the subject of our treatment of refugees.

'It fell to me to reply by sending a circular of January 13, 1852, which has since been referred to as laying down correctly our rights and obligations with regard to refugees, and to the Governments whose subjects they are.

'On January 21, 1852, Count Buol addressed a further note to me, inclosing one from Cardinal Antonelli complaining of the conduct of the British Government.

'I was not guilty of any personal discourtesy to Count Buol, a diplomatist of high character. If you refer to the parliamentary papers, you will see that I did not throw the notes after him, but I returned them in a despatch giving at length the reasons for doing so.

'I need not say that it gave me great satisfaction to note the very friendly way in which you refer to our old intimacy.

'Yours sincerely,

'GRANVILLE.'

Long after these events the pen of a German writer—possibly one of those numerous refugees who, after finding a haven in this country, were able to return to their native land in calmer days—recorded that among Lord Granville's titles to the gratitude of continental Liberalism was first and foremost the firmness with which at this moment he had protected the right of asylum in England, then gravely threatened.[1]

On almost the same day on which Lord Granville returned Count Buol's notes—the coincidence is interesting—

[1] *Frankfurter Zeitung*, March 31, 1891.

he received a request from Mr. Gladstone, in a letter which would appear to have been the first communication between them, to secure the safe passage into Naples through Malta of a packet containing copies of the famous pamphlet in which the author denounced the Government of the King: the ordinary means of communication being closed against it.

MR. GLADSTONE TO LORD GRANVILLE.

6 CARLTON GARDENS, *January* 31, 1852.

'MY DEAR LORD GRANVILLE,—Will you allow me to beg the favour that the accompanying packet containing copies of a recent publication of mine on *Neapolitan Persecutions*, and the cognate copies, may be forwarded to the Legation at Naples by the first box through Malta? The channel of communication by the post, I need hardly observe, is closed against us.

'I remain most sincerely yours,

'W. E. GLADSTONE.'

LORD GRANVILLE TO MR. GLADSTONE.

LONDON, W., *February* 29, 1852.

'MY DEAR MR. GLADSTONE,—I will take great care of your parcel. I am ashamed to say that although your pamphlet has the first place on my table, and I am dying to read it, I have not yet had time to do so.

'Yours truly,

'GRANVILLE.'

Before he left the Foreign Office, Lord Granville received from the Queen the assurance of the confidence which she had learnt to feel in him, short as his tenure there had been. The Queen was glad to have to trust to a Minister who felt that it was impossible for diplomacy to act with more effect than when it does so in a quiet and unostentatious manner.

The outgoing Prime Minister was equally emphatic in his praise. His words were few but weighty. 'I am very sorry,' Lord John Russell wrote, 'that the country will lose one of the best Foreign Secretaries it ever had. . . . *Tu Marcellus eris.*' [1]

[1] Lord John Russell to Lord Granville, February 21, 1852.

CHAPTER IV

THE ABERDEEN GOVERNMENT

1852–1855

THE Administration which Lord Derby formed in February 1852 out of the rump of the Tory party contained three men of first-rate ability: the Prime Minister himself; the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Disraeli; and the Chancellor, Lord St. Leonards. Taken as a whole it was among the weakest which has ever tried to govern the country. Of the Ministers, some were content to regard themselves as stop-gaps, and looked forward to a coalition between the followers of Lord John Russell and those of the late Sir Robert Peel as certain before long to put an end to their own career. Others hoped that a coalition between some of their own number and their former Peelite colleagues might yet take place. This was the wish of the little group of personal friends of whom Mr. Gladstone was the most eminent. Mr. Gladstone indeed persevered to the end of 1852 in the strange delusion that it was possible to drive the Conservative leader out of office and at the same time to secure the goodwill of the Conservative party.

'I never heard you called a Peelite [Lord Lincoln wrote to Lord Granville], but I have always perceived that if bygone nicknames are abandoned, there is no more difference of opinion between you and me than there must always be between any two men who think for themselves. Of course it has not escaped my observation that this coincidence of opinion between us is accompanied by a difference between us both and the older men under whom you commenced public life. The fact is that among men of Liberal opinions the difference is not Whig and Peelite, but the men of forty years of age (more or less) and those of the former generation. *Peelism*—if I

must still use the word—is really the more advanced form of Liberal opinion, cleared of that demagogic Liberalism which characterised the Liberalism of twenty years ago, and on the other hand of that oligarchic tendency of the old Whigs, who, wishing to extend freedom, sought to do it by making use of the people, instead of identifying themselves and their own interests with the people.'[1]

The time when a coalition is in the air is the opportunity of the parliamentary diplomatist. Mr. Ellice and Mr. Denison[2] were conspicuous types of this class among the Whigs in the House of Commons. The former, known to his friends as the Bear, not because of any rugged ferocity of disposition, but owing to his connection with the fur trade, was among those who had arrived at the conclusion that it would be impossible for Lord John again to be Prime Minister, at least immediately. Mr. Denison belonged to the section which, disliking many of the characteristics of the Peelite connection, was nevertheless willing to accept Peelite leadership, but was determined that Lord John Russell in any future arrangement should hold a position sufficiently strong to enable him to be an efficient trustee of Liberal principles. They both placed themselves in communication with Lord Granville, whose conciliatory disposition made him at this moment the natural recipient of the confidences of the various sections which had to be reconciled. Would either Lord John Russell serve with Lord Palmerston, or Lord Palmerston with Lord John Russell? would Lord Aberdeen work with Lord John? could anybody push Lord John into serving under Lord Aberdeen? how were former holders of office in Whig Governments to be persuaded to pass a self-denying ordinance in favour of the Peelites? how was some moderation in their demands to be suggested to the Peelites themselves, who were not guilty of under-estimating their own former sacrifices or their present claim to abundant compensation? Such were the questions of the hour. To find a way out of all these complications was a task precisely suited to the versatile talents of Lord Granville,

[1] Lord Lincoln to Lord Granville, April 18, 1853.

[2] Afterwards Speaker, and Viscount Ossington.

of which an unlimited patience formed part. 'Lincoln could not bear Lord John : Graham was suspicious : Palmerston was contemptuous :'[1] thus afterwards wrote the Duke of Argyll. Lord John Russell, on the other hand, was determined not to give way either to the dislike of Lord Lincoln, or to the suspicions of Sir James Graham, or to the rivalry of Lord Palmerston. Lord Granville staunchly supported his former chief in refusing to yield at discretion either to the ever-mounting bill of the Peelite requisitions, or to the evident desire of an influential section of the Whigs, whose centre was Lady Palmerston's *salon*, to substitute Lord Palmerston with a policy of domestic indifferentism for the reforming activities of Lord John Russell. But he also saw that compromise and concession were necessary, and threw his influence—already great with Lord John Russell—in favour of the co-operation with the Peelites which was being urged on the late Liberal Premier by Lord Lansdowne and the Duke of Bedford.

'I had not much difficulty in showing to Lord John [Lord Granville wrote in March to Mr. Denison] that you differed from the "rugged animal," or in explaining to him how you came to talk over these matters with Lord Lincoln. I told him what you said about the feeling that animated the Peelites, and that I had told you that I personally knew of no difficulties, excepting my suspicion of an irrational jealousy of Lord John on the part of that body ; that you had answered that you believed that there was some jealousy on their part ; that they supposed Lord John did not like a rival near the throne ; but that you were of opinion that although it was a matter of difficulty, this objection was not an insurmountable one, and that they might be induced to join, even without any concession on his part as to his position.'[2]

As the recipient of many confidences Lord Granville was thus able to play an important if minor part in bringing about the co-operation between the Whigs and the Peelites, which was the final result of the negotiations in which the principal share had necessarily to be taken by older states-

[1] Duke of Argyll to Lord Granville, December 9, 1889.
[2] Lord Granville to Mr. Denison, March 18, 1852.

men, the recognised leaders of the two parties. No union, indeed, could have been possible had not Lord Aberdeen, with perfect self-abnegation, exerted himself to remove the jealousies, suspicions, and dislike of Lord John Russell entertained by his own friends, and at the same time to disarm Lord John Russell's distrust of them. Lord Aberdeen, without Lord Granville's charm of manner and social popularity, had a remarkable power of bringing men together, qualities which he had shown at an earlier date in bringing about the reconciliation of Peel and Wellington. In 1852 he had gained authority from age and experience. On the Whig side these qualifications were possessed by Lord Lansdowne, and at the decisive moment it was Lord Aberdeen and Lord Lansdowne to whom the Queen sent in order to advise her in the crisis out of which the Coalition Government at length struggled into existence in the last days of 1852.

Lord John Russell was eventually persuaded, very largely by Lord Granville's influence, to make the necessary concession of the Premiership to Lord Aberdeen. In the Ministry thus formed it was determined that Lord John Russell should become leader of the House of Commons without portfolio; but in order to satisfy the scruples of Constitutional purists, who objected to a minister avoiding the ordeal of re-election by his constituents on acceptance of office under the Crown, he accepted the seals of the Secretaryship of State for Foreign Affairs, and after holding them a few weeks handed them over to Lord Clarendon. 'I think the machine will float,' Lord Granville wrote to Lord Stanley of Alderley, whom his familiar friends called 'Ben,' it was said with a reference to the late Mr. Benjamin Backbite rather than to that 'soldier bold' Mr. Benjamin Battle.[1] But Lord Granville noted that the mutual jealousy of the rank and file of both sections was still a source of danger, and that the final quarrels over the distribution of minor offices had only intensified it. Indeed, if the machine floated, it was amongst the shallows, and the public were unfortunately soon able to hear the groaning of the engine, the creaking of the planks, and the divergent

[1] Lord Granville to Lord Stanley of Alderley, December 29, 1852.

shouts of the crew. There was one minister who was always resigning, or about to resign; there was another who soon actually resigned, though it repented him and he returned; but these two ministers next to Lord Aberdeen were the leading men in the Ministry. Each of them had embittered partisans, and still more embittered enemies in Parliament and the press, whose utterances darkened the air with discord and suspicion. The differences in the Cabinet did not correspond with the division between Liberalism and Peelism. Lord Aberdeen in after-years was fond of dwelling on this, and in all probability, had the Crimean War not broken out, the differences might have been surmounted. But the Eastern question brought a new and fatal factor into the political situation before the Ministry was many months old, and in October 1853 Lord Clarendon and Lord John Russell were already consulting Lord Granville on a proposal that he should go on a special mission to Paris to sound the political waters there, and strengthen the hands of the Ambassador; but Lord Granville was of opinion that he and Lord Cowley might both be placed in a false position, and he declined the offer.[1]

Lord Granville had accepted the Presidency of the Council—a post which at one time had been among the most important in the State, and had gradually become one of the class of political sinecures. Quite recently it had been partially rescued out of that category by departmental duties connected with education becoming attached to it, at the time when, during the Presidency of Lord Lansdowne, amid the ill-will and alarm both of the Church and of Orthodox Dissent, the first steps towards organising a national system of education had been taken. Lord Granville desired to identify his name with a large measure of national education, and in 1853 his intention was to have proposed a plan as broad as the existing condition of public opinion would permit. But the shadow of the impending troubles in the East, and the increase of differences among his colleagues, soon compelled him to devote most of his time to the inner diplomacy of the

[1] Lord Aberdeen to Lord Clarendon, October 11, 1853.

Cabinet, on which the possibility of keeping the Government together almost entirely depended. These differences also had an effect on his own official position, and indirectly became the cause of the termination of his connection with the Education office.

It is perhaps difficult in an age which has seen without alarm more than one minister at different times holding a seat in the Cabinet without office, to the general advantage of the business of Parliament, fully to appreciate the strength of the objections felt in some quarters to the same arrangement when it was adopted in 1853 by Lord John Russell. The leadership of the House of Commons, and the control and general direction of business there, are tasks sufficient at any time to occupy the undivided care and attention of a minister; and the overt recognition of their importance by Lord John Russell was a more genuine tribute to the power and dignity of that great assembly, than any stiff adherence to a tradition of very doubtful correctness, that a Cabinet Minister must necessarily be weighted with the work of a department even if only a small one. 'I object,' said Mr. Disraeli, taking a higher view than did some of Lord John Russell's own colleagues, 'I object to shutting up great men in small rooms and binding to the triumphal chariot wheels of administrative ability all the fame and genius of the Whig party.'[1] In the eighteenth century Lord Hardwicke had held, and at this very moment Lord Lansdowne was actually holding, a seat in the Cabinet without office, and the Duke of Wellington had done so before him. These, however, it might be said, were peers; though why a peer was to be excepted from the rule applied to a commoner, nobody had explained. Nevertheless, there was high authority to be cited in favour of the application of the rule to the leader of the House. Lord John Russell, however, by the offer he had made of accepting the Chiltern Hundreds and then seeking re-election, and by his actual acceptance of the Foreign Office, which vacated his seat in Parliament, had amply satisfied whatever reasonable scruples based on the prin-

[1] February 18, 1853. *Hansard*, ccxxiv. 288, 289.

ciples of the Constitution could be said to exist on the subject.[1]

The real reason of the outcry was to be found elsewhere than in any respect for constitutional precedent. The section of the House of Commons which desired a suspension of the reforming energies of the Liberal party, backed by the powerful voice of London society, objected to an arrangement which they saw not only secured to Lord John Russell that effective general control of business which every leader of the House must possess, but was also favourable to his determination not to lose sight of domestic reforms, even in the critical state of foreign affairs then existing. Well aware of the nature of the situation, Lord John Russell, when consenting to serve under Lord Aberdeen and to lead the House of Commons, had stipulated that he should hold a position free from the cares incidental to constant attention to departmental details. He was able in addition to plead that considerations of health made the stipulation imperative. But the stipulation was not made by him in the sense which afterwards was sought to be attributed to it, as implying a claim on his part to any unusual exercise of interference with the work of the various departments of the Government, or any arrogation to himself of the privileges of the Prime Minister in that respect. He simply desired to have a firm hold on the business of the House of Commons. The First Lordship of the Treasury—in itself a sinecure office—was held, as in those days it always was held, by the Minister, Lord Aberdeen, whom the Queen had entrusted with the formation of the Government. Lord John Russell was accordingly himself obliged when he gave up the Foreign Office either to fall back on one of the posts of Cabinet rank which are free from heavy departmental duties, or to adopt the course which he actually did, viz. that of leading the House without office. But the clamour on the subject continued. He therefore took the opportunity in 1854 of the division of the work of the War Office and the Colonial Office to explain frankly

[1] See the whole subject discussed in Todd, *Parliamentary Government*, ii. 459, 460.

the difficulties of his position to Lord Granville, and asked him to accept the Chancellorship of the Duchy, so as to allow Lord John himself to become President of the Council, and thereby terminate the discussion about the propriety of his position. Lord Granville readily entered into the views of his chief, whose difficulties he felt and appreciated.

'I was quite sure [Lord John wrote to him] that you would yourself behave as you have. In fact, I ought to have insisted on the Presidency of the Council when the Government was formed; and I should then not have forced you to go through a process which I own is disagreeable. However, you will have the office which Morpeth held in my Cabinet, and have the merit of being a martyr to my grasping spirit into the bargain.'[1]

So Mr. Strutt—who really was the person who had a right to complain—was abruptly removed from the Chancellorship of the Duchy, and Lord Granville became Chancellor in his place. Lord John Russell then became President of the Council. But his proceedings, to a public which did not understand the true inwardness of what had happened, suggested a comparison with the ways of the hermit crab without a shell, which is said not to be over-scrupulous in dispossessing colleagues who have found the retreat which he covets; while the manner in which Lord Granville accommodated himself to the exigencies, or the necessities, of his chief, increased the general confidence in him and gave an indication of the strength which knows when best to yield and when to wait.

In the division of the War and Colonial Offices which now took place, Sir George Grey was appointed Colonial Secretary; Lord Lincoln—now Duke of Newcastle—as the man in possession at the War Office, continuing there. The new arrangement did not prevent the disasters of the winter of 1854.

'Why [Mr. Gladstone asked Lord Granville long after these events] did not Lord John arrange in 1854, as Lord Aberdeen wished, to let you have the Colonial Office on quitting the Presidency? Why did he become a party to the gross mistake of encouraging Newcastle

[1] Lord John Russell to Lord Granville, June 14, 1854.

to take the War Office; and then in November try to put him out without any stateable case?'[1]

Lord John Russell's reply probably would have been that, out of four Secretaries of State, three under the arrangement suggested by Lord Aberdeen would have been in the House of Lords, an arrangement which would not have been long tolerated. The result would have been another redistribution of offices at a short interval of time, and a further irritation of the public mind over constant changes with no adequate result.

Lord John Russell was now rightly insisting that the reform of the administrative departments could not stop at the separation of the Colonial Office and the War Office. There was still, *mirabile dictu*, a Secretary at War as well as the Secretary of State for War. Lord John urged that the two departments ought to be combined, and that Lord Palmerston should be the head of a reconstituted and supreme War Office.

'The war of departments [Lord Granville wrote to the Duke of Argyll] rages furiously. Graham complained frivolously of the contradictory orders which he received. He pitched indirectly into the Commissariat and the Secretary at War—the latter pitched into the Cabinet and the Commander-in-Chief, who, having no friends, was hard hit. Molesworth made some cutting remarks when it was proved by Sidney Herbert that all the omissions and commissions were owing to the Board of Works, who had not yet completed the War Office.'[2]

Eventually Lord John Russell, not being able to get his way about the consolidation of the different War Departments into one, and having failed to carry the Prime Minister with him, threatened—and not for the first time—to resign, and so informed Lord Granville, inclosing a letter from Lord Minto, who gave expression to the public feeling that the war

Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville, November 2, 1889. It appears that Mr. Gladstone was mistaken in one point. Lord Aberdeen wished Mr. S. Herbert to go to the War Office, but the Duke was in possession and declined to move.

[2] Lord Granville to the Duke of Argyll, November 17, 1854. See also Memorandum by Lord John Russell in *Life of Lord John Russell*, ii. 227. The details of the controversy will be found in ch. xxv. of that work. Mr. Sidney Herbert was Secretary at War.

was not being conducted with adequate energy. Lord Granville agreed as to the serious character of the situation, but urged upon Lord John that a more vigorous assertion of their own views in the Cabinet would be more effectual than unfulfilled threats of resignation. In a letter to Lord John Russell occasioned by a dispute as to the dismissal from the Office of Woods and Forests of Mr. Kennedy, which had led to friction between Lord Aberdeen and Lord John Russell, he asked leave of the latter to pass from that subject to the wider one of his relations with the Prime Minister.[1] The treatment of Mr. Kennedy might be unjust;

'but [he said] the question of Russell and Aberdeen is much more serious and has caused me intense anxiety. I wished to write and speak to you on the subject, but as you have never communicated with me on it, I was afraid of your thinking me officious or presumptuous, if I was to begin without some such occasion as your sending me Lord's Minto's letter gives me. On the formation of the Government you made great personal sacrifices, some of a very painful kind, for what you thought the public good. Since then you have had many annoyances to bear. I hope you will not allow these two years of self-sacrifice to be thrown away, as you certainly will do if you break up the present Administration, at a moment when no other Government appears possible, and when the Cabinet appear unanimous in their desire to carry on the war with the utmost vigour.

'When I see the effective manner in which you have once or twice this winter forced the Government to greater exertion, I cannot hold you wholly irresponsible if it has been guilty of remissness on other occasions.

'I told Lord Minto last summer that whenever you took upon yourself to exercise that authority which belonged to your character in the country, your great antecedents, and your position as leader of the House of Commons, I could perceive no disposition in a large majority of the Cabinet other than to be guided by your views. If you would take a little more trouble in insisting upon information, in forcing the Cabinet to decide, and afterwards ascertaining whether such decisions have been acted upon, you would have no difficulty in enforcing many things which you have recommended and which have not been done.

[1] It is not clear that this letter was actually sent. The letter of Lord Minto referred to above is to be found at vol. ii. p. 228 of the *Life of Lord John Russell.*

'No one can have filled such a space in the world as you have done, without having secret as well as public enemies. Nothing would give so much pleasure to these, and so much pain to those whose first wish it is to agree and vote with you, as for you to take a course the motives of which are liable to a most unjust misconstruction, and which the public will know is disapproved by Lord Lansdowne, George Grey, and all your own political friends in the Cabinet.

'You will add one to the many kindnesses which I have received from you, by forgiving me for obtruding my opinion on you at this moment.' [1]

For the moment Lord John Russell acted on the advice contained in Lord Granville's letter, and a few days after he was writing as follows in regard to the siege of Sebastopol:—

LORD JOHN RUSSELL TO LORD GRANVILLE.

December 24, 1854.

'MY DEAR GRANVILLE,—I have endeavoured to obtain the materials for some judgment on the future conduct of the war.

'Without such materials it is impossible to judge correctly.

'So far as we can learn, it is intended to get all the guns in position, to batter the Russian forts and the town for forty-eight hours, and then to try an assault.

'This plan seems practicable. It may be interrupted, either by a strong sortie from the town, or by an attack like that of Inkermann.

'Supposing this not to take place, we either succeed in the attack or we fail.

'If we succeed, we have only to destroy the place and come away to Constantinople.

'If we fail, we shall find it difficult to come away. To continue the siege seems hopeless in such a case. Ammunition will be wanting, and the work in the trenches will wear our army to shreds without the possibility of any reinforcements beyond the 5,000 men of the Mediterranean garrisons.

'One course remains, which I hope may be practicable, even if on farther inquiry it may be found unadvisable. It is to withdraw the heavy guns from the batteries and embark them; to place the men in huts with the exception of strong pickets towards the town and Inkermann and Balaclava; to send all the sick and weakly to Constantinople and Malta; and in this position to await the attacks of the enemy, and the approach of spring.

[1] Lord Granville to Lord John Russell, December 12, 1854.

'Whether such a course would be advisable or not, must in a great degree depend on the decision of Austria. If she acts with us, we must combine our plans for the next campaign with her. If she now at half past the eleventh hour declines to do so, we must consider how we can best do without her. In that case it may be advisable to transfer our chief exertions to Asia, and endeavour by that road to work up to the Crimea.

'It appears that 185,000 men English and French have been ordered, first and last, to the Crimea. That they have not produced a greater impression, considering their proved superiority in quality to the Russian troops, must be attributed partly to the commanders of the expedition, but partly also to the plan pursued of moving by successive detachments, instead of one great effort.

'In this respect the French are more to blame than we are. But we must take our share of the responsibility, whatever it may be.

'I remain yours faithfully,

'J. RUSSELL.'

The break-up of the Government, which so far had only been with difficulty avoided, at length came in January 1855. On the day of the reassembling of Parliament, Mr. Roebuck at once gave notice of a motion, which amounted to a vote of censure on the Duke of Newcastle and his administration of the War Office. Lord John Russell thereupon resigned, declining to make himself responsible in Parliament for the defence of arrangements which the whole of the previous year he had been occupied in attempting to alter, but had failed to alter owing to the indifference or hostility of some of his colleagues. Lord Granville appears to have been the first person informed of his decision. 'I think it right,' Lord John wrote to him,'as you are so good a friend, to inform you that I have sent my resignation to Lord Aberdeen. He will read my note to the Cabinet.'[1] Meanwhile a sharp passage of arms was taking place between Lord Granville and the Duke of Newcastle on a different subject. The old troubles had revived, and in an acute shape, about the action of the *Times* newspaper, and the relations, real or supposed, of some of the ministers with that powerful journal. The Duke of Newcastle accused Lord Granville of being unduly intimate with the

[1] Lord John Russell to Lord Granville, January 24, 1855.

editor, and Lord Granville replied as follows in a letter which he circulated among his colleagues :—

MEMORANDUM BY LORD GRANVILLE.

'The Duke of Newcastle spoke in a very kind and friendly manner to me this evening on the subject of the *Times*.

'He told me that circumstances had come to his knowledge which threw grave suspicions on the motives and objects of the conductors of that paper, that it behoved men in my position to be careful in communicating with them, and that he mentioned this to me as there was a general opinion, probably exaggerated, that I was closely connected with that paper through my acquaintance with Mr. Delane and my intimacy with Charles Greville.

'I have been long aware of some such impressions, and I am truly grateful to the Duke for giving me an opportunity, without exposing myself to the penalties of the French proverb, of giving him an explanation on this matter, and of repeating that explanation to my colleagues on the eve of their ceasing to be so.

'Public men have three ways of communicating with writers in the press ; 1st, showing them social civilities ; 2nd, furnishing them with facts and arguments which need not be kept secret, and which may be useful in determining public opinion ; and 3rd, imparting to them official secrets which ought not to be divulged.

'I plead guilty to having adopted the first course. Mr. Delane and Mr. Reeve have frequently dined with me and have come to Lady Granville's parties. I have for some time found it entailed personal inconvenience from the impressions which it creates, but I am sure that on public grounds nothing can be so mischievous as to exclude from all community of interest with the higher classes, and all intercourse with public men, those who by their pen can exercise such enormous influence for good or for bad.

'The second mode requires tact, and has disadvantages as well as advantages, but it is perfectly legitimate. During the time of the Exhibition, I recommended the Executive Committee to show every civility and give all the information in their power to the whole press. Otherwise, I have not adopted this practice, partly from caution, perhaps a little from indolence. During the short time I was at the Foreign Office, I gave no effect to the direct and indirect overtures which were made to me from the *Times*. In the other offices which I have held no such temptation existed.

'The third course appears to me to be simply dishonourable, and I solemnly declare that I have never given directly or indirectly such information to any writer in the *Times*.

'With respect to Charles Greville, his position as to the *Times* has been much misrepresented. He has no sort of influence over the general conduct of the paper. He does not write in it, excepting such letters as are signed "Carolus," or "C. C. G.," which he openly avows, and I believe him to be too honourable knowingly and intentionally to afford improper information to the writers in that paper. As, however, I have long known his love of political gossip, and his habit of constantly receiving Delane and Reeve, who of course come to pick up what they can, I have for some years been more scrupulous in my conversation with Greville than with any equally intimate friend, and I can declare as positively as above that among all the articles in the *Times* proving official indiscretion during the Administration of Lord John and that of Lord Aberdeen, not a single one has been derived from information given by me to Charles Greville.' [1]

Mr. Roebuck's motion was carried, and on January 29 Lord Aberdeen resigned. A period of unexampled confusion followed his retirement. Lord Derby declined to attempt to form an Administration. The Queen then sent for Lord Lansdowne; and on his advice she sent for Lord John Russell. Lord John at once communicated with Lord Granville, who with Mr. Sidney Herbert supported him in a short-lived effort to form a Government. 'I think your feelings about John Russell,' the Duke of Devonshire wrote on February 2, 'very generous and creditable to you; but it has always been my opinion that you conferred more than you received.' [2] Lord John Russell soon had to announce the failure of his attempt, owing to the refusal of his principal colleagues in former Administrations to join in a purely Whig Administration, and to their disapproval of his recent resignation.

LORD JOHN RUSSELL TO LORD GRANVILLE.

February 3, 1855.

'MY DEAR GRANVILLE,—I have been so busy to-day that I had no time to go and see you. But I should like much that you should come and see me in the course of the evening.

[1] January 25, 1855.

[2] The Duke of Devonshire to Lord Granville, February 2, 1855. See also Greville, *Journal of the Reign of Queen Victoria*, 1852–60, i. 143.

'I was in hopes this morning to have restored to you your dignity as President of the Council. But the sky grows very cloudy in the afternoon, and it now appears that every Ministry is impossible. However, I should like to talk it over with you.

'Yours sincerely,

'J. RUSSELL.'

Referring to these events in after years, Mr. Gladstone wrote to Lord Granville at the time of the appearance in 1889 of the *Life of Lord John Russell*, by Mr. Spencer Walpole, that in his opinion—

'in the first half of his Life, Lord John Russell's figure comes out very great, as well as very good. In the second half the difficulties he had to contend with were more formidable; lying in many cases among his own people: he is good all through, but not I think so great as in the Melbourne period. His biography takes two volumes —Palmerston's occupies five. But Lord John's place in British history is five times as great. Though I was on the other side during his best period, I was much impressed by him, and I do not recollect ever to have spoken a disparaging or disrespectful word of him.'[1]

But the political world at the time which this narrative has reached did not take a favourable view of Lord John Russell's most recent proceedings, and in any case it was quite obvious that not Lord John Russell but Lord Palmerston was the man whom public opinion indicated unmistakably to be the necessary Premier. Lord John Russell had himself declared Lord Palmerston to be the only man fit to conduct the war, and the Queen—though still retaining her old suspicions—bowed to the general demand and charged him with the formation of a Ministry. This task he successfully performed.

Lord Granville's close connection with Mr. Gladstone, which is one of the most marked features in his career, may be said to have begun at this time.

'There was an admirable fitness in your union [Lord Acton wrote

[1] Mr. Gladstone's correspondence with Lord Aberdeen at the time of the break-up of the Aberdeen Cabinet might necessitate some qualification of the above observations. For an exactly similar estimate of the relative claims of Lord Palmerston and Lord Russell on posterity see Saint-René Taillandier, *Le Roi Léopold et la Reine Victoria*, ii. 366–367.

many years after to Mr. Gladstone] and I had been able to watch how it became closer and easier in spite of so much to separate you in mental habits, in early affinities, and even in the form of fundamental convictions, since he came home from your budget, overwhelmed, thirty-eight years ago. I saw all the connections which had their root in social habit fade before the one which took its rise from public life, and proved more firm and more enduring than the rest.' [1]

Of the new Ministry Mr. Gladstone was a member, Lord John Russell was not. The late leader of the House, however, accepted a mission to Vienna as one of the plenipotentiaries to the Conference which had assembled there on the invitation of the Austrian Government, in order to attempt to devise conditions of peace. With Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Sidney Herbert and the Duke of Newcastle also had accepted office. Lord Clarendon remained Minister for Foreign Affairs.

Lord Granville returned to the Presidency of the Council in the new Ministry.

'I rejoice to hear [Mr. Sidney Herbert wrote to him] that you are to be reinstated in the office of President of the Council, where you will be in a condition to render the same excellent service to the present Government as you did to the last.' [2]

Lord Granville at once informed Lord Aberdeen.

'Lord Palmerston [he said] has offered the Presidency of the Council to me, which I have accepted ; but I cannot resist this opportunity of thanking you for all your kindness to me, and of expressing my appreciation of the advantage it has been to me to serve under one of the most just, liberal, and courageous men with whom it has ever been my good fortune to be associated.' [3] 'Be assured [was the prompt reply] that I look back to all my personal relations with you as a source of the greatest pleasure, and that I shall never forget how much I owe to your conciliatory and obliging disposition.' [4]

[1] *Life of Gladstone*, iii. 462.
[2] Mr. S. Herbert to Lord Granville, February 5, 1855.
[3] Lord Granville to Lord Aberdeen, February 7, 1855.
[4] Lord Aberdeen to Lord Granville, February 8, 1855.

A far more difficult question, however, remained than who was to be the occupant of the ancient and honourable office of Lord President. Lord Aberdeen as Prime Minister had naturally acted as leader of the Coalition Government in the Lords; and with him had acted Lord Lansdowne, who had led the Liberal peers after the retirement of Lord Melbourne. He had been sent for by the Queen simultaneously with Lord Aberdeen in 1852, and had accepted a seat in the Cabinet. Lord Palmerston now hoped to be able to induce him to return to his former position as leader in the Lords, and believed at first that he had succeeded.

LORD PALMERSTON TO LORD GRANVILLE.

PICCADILLY, *February* 6, 1855.

'MY DEAR GRANVILLE,—I am very glad to find that all is come right at last. Will you be President of the Council? Lord Lansdowne agrees to be the organ of the Government in the House of Lords, on condition that you will give him your assistance in regard to matters with which you are more familiar than he is. 'Yours sincerely,

'PALMERSTON.'

LORD GRANVILLE TO LORD LANSDOWNE.

LONDON, *February* 7, 1855.

'MY DEAR LORD LANSDOWNE,—Lord Palmerston, in his note offering the Council Office to me, said that you had consented to become the organ of the Government in the House of Lords, on the condition that I should undertake to assist you.

'When you are in the Cabinet, it is of course impossible that you should not be the first person in the assembly in which you sit, but I never imagined that you would consider yourself bound to be in the House at five o'clock and sit on to the close of the debate excepting on very important occasions, nor that you should take any trouble in ascertaining from different departments what was to be said in answer to insignificant questions. But it is of the greatest importance for us all as well as for me, that you should not mark too clearly that you do not answer for the Government. For instance, if you announce the construction of the new Government, it will at once give a tone to the feeling in the House.

'For myself I feel how little useful I shall be in any capacity; but I could play my part with double the effect, and with double the ease myself, if you allow me to speak as your temporary *locum tenens*.

'I apprehend it will not be necessary to make any distinct statement to the House as to whether you lead it or not. The House will look for your guidance on all important occasions, and will think it perfectly natural that you should throw upon your younger colleagues all the routine work. 'GRANVILLE.'

LORD LANSDOWNE to LORD GRANVILLE.

BERKELEY SQUARE, *Wednesday morning, February* 8, 1855.

'MY DEAR GRANVILLE,—Many thanks for your note last night, but I must tell you that it rather startled me, for I cannot accept the compliment you so kindly pay me, if you have understood that I had taken upon myself what is called the leadership of the House of Lords.

'This is not so, for when Palmerston pressed upon me yesterday to undertake it, with the office I formerly held, but which on every account it is much more desirable you should hold, I should if I had accepted one have accepted both, for I do not think the leader ought to be out of office; and as I told him when after mature consideration I had determined some time ago to secure peace and comfort at my age by taking a step backwards, it would not do for me to take a step in advance now.

'Palmerston then said he hoped I should not object on some particular occasions to represent the Government, and this I could not refuse, reserving it to myself to judge of the necessity or expediency when the case arose, and this is the whole *length and breadth* of my undertaking, so long as I feel myself able to take any part, and it is most essential to me that it should be distinctly understood. 'Yours ever truly,

'LANSDOWNE.'

The result of Lord Lansdowne's refusal was the offer by Lord Palmerston of the lead in the House of Lords to Lord Granville. When after long hesitation the offer was accepted, Lord Granville entered on a task which—with the brief exception of the interval from 1865 to 1868, when Lord Russell on becoming Prime Minister necessarily became leader in the House of Lords—was discharged by him continuously till his death in 1891. Lord Granville ardently desired to have the co-operation of his cousin Lord Carlisle at this difficult moment. But Lord Carlisle was among those who actively dissented from the policy which had embarked the country in the war. Lord Granville himself—and Lord

Carlisle was doubtless aware of it—had also had his doubts, and only yielded his own personal opinions to the experience of older colleagues. 'My own belief,' he afterwards wrote, 'is that the Crimean war was a great misfortune, and that either Palmerston or Aberdeen alone would have prevented it.'[1] There is a glimpse of a dinner at Lord Granville's house in Bruton Street in the early part of 1854, where Lord Aberdeen and Mr. Bright were both present, and Mr. Bright left with a distinct opinion that the Prime Minister was 'not perfectly satisfied with the policy of the struggle into which the country was unhappily drifting.'[2] The same observation applied to his host.

'My reason tells me [Lord Carlisle wrote to Lord Granville] that as I had no share in the counsels which led to this war, it is perhaps better for my peace, with the increasing horror I have of it, not to have any say in those which are requisite for carrying it on.'[3]

But if Lord Granville committed himself to the war with doubts as to its expediency, he was fully convinced that the war when once begun had to be pushed on with vigour, even if Sir Stratford Canning's diplomacy had not been calculated to secure peace. The causes of the rupture of peace were he thought to be sought in considerations of a broad kind and in the general situation of Europe, rather than in the particular facts and circumstances of the diplomatic situation at the moment. He had no sympathy with a cynical class of criticism afterwards fashionable in regard to these events, which regarded the war as merely the result of unconscious blundering and ignorant miscalculations. The final judgment on the affairs of a bygone period has to be founded on something besides the critical study of State Papers and the accurate comparison of the dates of the despatches of Ministers, which frequently afford but an imperfect and soulless record, and are not the true key of the ideas and passions from which spring the great events of history. No war was ever more popular. It was

[1] Lord Granville to the Duke of Argyll, February 19, 1887.
[2] Mr. Bright to Lord Aberdeen, March 16, 1854.
[3] Lord Carlisle to Lord Granville, February 10, 1855.

indeed far more popular with the nation than with many of the members of the Government, and it was only reluctantly and after a struggle of nearly two years that the country consented to conclude peace at a time when their allies had already begun eagerly to desire it. Why was this so? Is it to be lightly believed that the nation was either acting under some gigantic hallucination, or was actuated by nothing but want of political foresight as to the future of the Turkish Empire, or was simply animated by a senseless pugnacity and desire of aggrandisement, or was the victim of the angry vindictiveness of Sir Stratford Canning and of the wiles of the chief of the restored French Empire? Such views are those of critics writing long after the events to which they relate. The quarrel, it has often been said, about the Holy Places was an affair not sufficient by itself to have caused war, and diplomacy was twice all but successful in the course of 1854 in finding a formula in regard to the claim made by Russia of a protectorate over the Christians in Turkey, sufficient to reconcile the views of the Czar with those of the Porte. But to acknowledge this is only to suggest the question: why then did war take place notwithstanding; what were the causes which doomed diplomacy to fail; what finally lit up the great European conflagration? Was it simply an error made in backing the wrong instead of the right horse? Even now on a dispassionate survey of these events is it clear that if the Porte were the wrong horse, Russia was the right one? To neither of these two questions can an affirmative answer be given. In order to find a sufficient explanation of the great decision for which Lord Granville had his share of responsibility we must look further. In the arrogant attitude of Russia ever since 1815 towards Europe, to which she seemed hardly to belong, in the ever increasing insolence of that attitude since the accession of the Emperor Nicholas, in the existence of a threatening military autocracy rendered doubly odious by half-mystical claims, and in the translation of those claims into action against liberty not merely in Poland or Hungary but all over Europe, is to be found the explanation of the Crimean War. These things

had produced an atmosphere of alarm and hatred out of which the lightning was certain sooner or later to leap. No quarrel about the Holy Places, no dispute about the Christian subjects of the Porte, could possibly have dragged an unwilling Prime Minister to associate the history of his Government with a war against a country to which he was, to say the least, not personally hostile. It was the belief which animated the people that Western civilisation was threatened in its essential conceptions of individual and political liberty which forced him on, and sent the armies and fleets of Great Britain, France, and Sardinia, with no adequate cause of immediate quarrel, to the shores of the Black Sea and the Baltic. It is no exaggeration to say that if the Crimean War had never been fought, the two subsequent decades of the century would not have seen the formation of a United Italy and a United Germany and all the consequences. Within only a few months of the Treaty of 1856, Prince Gortchakoff issued a Circular Despatch as a protest against Lord Clarendon's vigorous denunciation of the misgovernment of the Kingdom of Naples.[1] What would have been the position of Europe if Prince Gortchakoff had represented the Government of a victorious or even an undefeated Russia? The recollections of 1830 and 1849 supply the answer.

[1] See Greville, *Journal of the Reign of Queen Victoria*, ii. 59.

CHAPTER V

THE PALMERSTON GOVERNMENT

1855

'YOU are an able negotiator,' Lord Palmerston wrote to Lord Granville in the midst of the multifarious troubles incidental to the formation of a new Government, some of which he said afforded 'examples of the saying that the Sovereign may make a peer, but cannot make a gentleman.'[1] But there were more serious difficulties than those arising from the unregenerate nature of man in regard to the distribution of titles and decorations. Hardly had the Government been formed before Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Sidney Herbert, and Sir James Graham resigned, owing to the decision taken by the new Premier to carry out the inquiry promised by the previous Government into the causes of the disasters of the war. To this inquiry the Peelite statesmen objected as in their opinion no longer necessary after the fall of Lord Aberdeen and the retirement of the Duke of Newcastle from the War Office. Lord John Russell, who was just about to start for Vienna, was then persuaded to become Colonial Secretary, but proceeded on his mission.

The Emperor Napoleon had terrified his allies in the last days of 1854 by a proposal to go to the Crimea and himself take the command. It required all the skill and personal influence of Lord Clarendon, who in 1855 visited the Emperor in his camp at Boulogne, to dissuade him from the venture. But the experiment of appointing to a foreign mission an ex-Prime Minister hitherto unversed in diplomacy proved as disturbing a factor in the political situation as the appearance of the French Emperor might have been on the

[1] Lord Palmerston to Lord Granville, February 3, March 28, 1855.

field of battle in the East. By April Lord Clarendon was writing in despair to Lord Granville about 'the devilries at Vienna.' 'Drouyn de l'Huys and John Russell,' he lamented, 'seem to be under the atmospheric influence of the place, which makes "Dips" forget their instructions.' [1] A deadlock was the result. Grave divergences between the commanders on the field of action, and a want of united action between the two armies, were also reported to exist. In the House of Lords the Duke of Newcastle was threatening vengeance in the character of the candid friend, and the attitude of Lord Granville's former Under-Secretary, Mr. Austen Henry Layard, as well as that of Mr. Roebuck, was a source of constant and still greater apprehension in the House of Commons.

'I entirely believe [Lord Granville wrote to Mr. Layard] what you tell me about your friendly feelings towards myself, and I can assure you that there has never been any change in mine towards you. I do not mean to say that I have never felt annoyance or irritation at the somewhat reckless and intemperate manner in which you have worked your views (in some of which I entirely agree) before Parliament, on the platform, and through the press; but I have never ceased holding the same language to those who have twitted me with the result of my connection with you. "I appointed Mr. Layard Under-Secretary of State wholly on public grounds. During the weeks which he served under me, I found him more useful to me than some of those who had been at the work all their lives, and I liked him in every respect. He is the only man I know who had reason to complain on personal grounds on the formation of Lord Aberdeen's Government; as questions soon arose about which Mr. Layard knew much, felt strongly, and on which he sincerely disapproved the policy of the Government. To expect an able and energetic man to remain silent on such an occasion was absurd; and it was equally ridiculous to expect that anyone perfectly new to public life should weigh his words or measure his actions as carefully as those who have been at the trade in or out of office for a quarter of a century."' [2]

In May, before the plenipotentiaries actually separated and the Conference at Vienna came to a formal conclusion,

[1] Lord Clarendon to Lord Granville, April 25, 1855.
[2] Lord Granville o Mr. Layard, May 4, 1855.

Count Buol, who was now Austrian Minister for Foreign Affairs, made a last attempt to bring the parties together. The principal point of difference lay in the arrangements to be made as to the Black Sea and the Dardanelles. A variety of proposals and counter-proposals had been put forward. The Austrian proposal was that the principle of counterpoise might be accepted by Russia; viz. that the number of the ships which she might keep in the Black Sea having been first determined, any addition to it might be followed by the admission into those waters of an equal number of war vessels from the allied fleets. Lord John Russell was favourable to the acceptance of the proposal; so was M. Drouyn de l'Huys. But Lord Palmerston was hostile. Public opinion also had been only partially satisfied by the fall of Lord Aberdeen and the disappearance of the Duke of Newcastle. It soon began to be whispered that the new Secretary of State for War, Lord Panmure, was not more efficient than his predecessor, and that the Cabinet as a whole did not realise the serious condition of affairs. Some of the ministers themselves shared the doubts of the wisdom of the colleague whom Lord Clarendon dubbed 'Mars,' and Lord Granville described as a 'Scotch divinity,' more fit perhaps to direct a campaign in the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland than on the shores of the Black Sea.[1] Difficulties of another kind arose from the language of M. de Persigny, who had succeeded M. Walewski as French Ambassador in London. He claimed the privilege of ancient personal friendship in order to deal faithfully with the French Emperor, and also did not hesitate in conversation to blurt out whatever was passing through his mind about his Sovereign. Lord Granville had gone over to Paris in April in order to support the objections which Lord Clarendon had already urged to the Emperor's plan of going to the Crimea. Thither too had flown the French Ambassador; and he characteristically took the earliest opportunity of describing an inspired article which had appeared in a leading French official newspaper as a 'panegyric on failure.' This remark he followed up in

[1] Lord Granville to Lord Clarendon, September 17, 1855.

conversation with Lord Granville by some pointed ridicule of the general position of his Sovereign.

'I have heard Legitimists rail against the present state of things [Lord Granville wrote to the Foreign Secretary], I have listened to twice as violent language from the Orleanists against the person of the Emperor and his Government; but all this is milk and water to the opposition speech made to me by Persigny last night. He talked a good deal about Lord Palmerston, and when I told him that Lord Palmerston had been struck by his conversation, he seemed pleased, and determined to strike me too; and he began with much cleverness and eagerness showing how every step in the campaign had been wrong, had been late, &c.; excepting in a few instances in which his advice had been taken. He said the same faults would be continued, as they had their origin in the character of the *maître*. "Some kings, such as Alexander &c., could plan and execute everything by themselves; others could do so by their counsellors; a third class could do neither" (Machiavelli). The Emperor belonged to the second class. He had no invention; not much knowledge and no judgment. When a plan with all its bearing was laid before him he could judge right. But, whether from idleness or pride he hardly knew, the Emperor rarely consulted anybody. He decided upon sending his fleet to the Baltic last year without consulting his Ministry, and then confessed he did not know whether Kronstadt was on an island or on the mainland. He multiplied instances of this sort. . . . The Emperor in the Crimea would be fatal. He, Persigny, would pack up his goods if he went. . . . His talk was in parts very wild, in parts hitting the right nail on the head.'[1]

The Emperor had greatly resented the opposition to his ambition of leading his own armies. 'A visit to London, a victory over the Russians in the Crimea, and a reception of the Queen of England in Paris before the end of the summer,' became his fixed ideas. 'I did not say, "Excusez du peu,"' was Lord Granville's comment.[2] To the Prince Consort he expressed his apprehensions more fully in the following memorandum:—

LORD GRANVILLE TO THE PRINCE CONSORT.

April 16, 1855.

'I take the liberty of writing a few lines, which I venture to hope your Royal Highness will allow me to consider as confidentially

[1] Lord Granville to Lord Clarendon, April 12, 1855. [2] *Ibid.*

addressed to yourself. The present moment is an anxious and a critical one. We are about to break off negotiations for peace, on grounds which will be disapproved by a small but intelligent minority in England, and by overwhelming majorities in France and Austria. I believe, for reasons which it is not necessary to recapitulate, we are quite right to do so, but always with one proviso, that we see reasonable hope of prosecuting the war with success. Such an expectation must rest upon there being somewhere a plan of operations, and one which is likely to be executed with vigour and *ensemble*. I am not sure that the leading members of the Government, with the exception of Lord Clarendon, are sufficiently impressed with this view. I am sure none have at present a comprehensive plan to submit to the conference over which your Royal Highness and the Emperor will preside at Windsor. The only recent instructions which I know of as being addressed to the English commanders, were issued after a loose conversation in the Cabinet, as to the importance of taking Kertch. I rather doubt these instructions having been communicated to the French Government. Lord Raglan answers them by saying that he cannot spare men from his small force, and that General Canrobert declines assisting him for this purpose. The latter had probably received no such instructions from home, and may possibly have received exactly contrary ones, as to the necessity of concentrating his army as much as possible. There seems to be much misunderstanding between the two commanders-in-chief in the Crimea, who neither of them appear to have any imagination or invention, or the power of forming for themselves plans, based on general instructions from home. The junior English officers revenge themselves for the past sneers of the French army on our want of organisation, by writing home hundreds of letters that the "French don't like fighting," that the "French had behaved well the previous night ; they had only run away once," &c. &c. The Russians, on the other hand, seem to gain confidence ; act with unity, and have found out who their good generals are. The remedy for this state of things is that *the Emperor is to go out to the Crimea* ! which, putting all political reasons aside, is stated by his most confidential military friend, Colonel Fleury, as a move likely to have a bad effect on the army ; while his most intimate and most honest civil friend, M. de Persigny, told me that his master, partly from unwillingness to consult others, partly from habits of procrastination, and partly from ignorance, is incapable of mastering the facts, and arranging the details necessary for the success of a great plan. If this view of the case is at all correct, one cannot be surprised that Lord Malmesbury should have told Lord Cowley that Lord Ellen-

borough had persuaded him *personally*, that as we seemed likely to go on in the same way, and with the same generals, great disasters were so sure to ensue, that it was far better to have peace at once on any terms. My own hopes rest entirely on what may be settled this week. It will be very unlike your Royal Highness if you have not very clear and decided views as to what should be done; as to the nature of the instructions which should be sent hence; what measures should be adopted for future uniformity of instructions from Paris and London, and what other steps must be adopted for the efficient execution of instructions in the Crimea. My own impression is that as it is impossible to put the two armies under one head, the sooner they could be completely separated the better. What I venture to ask your Royal Highness is, not to be satisfied with a general acquiescence in your views, but that your plan, or a better one if it can be proposed, be formally adopted and recognised.

'G.'

The old suspicion of Lord Palmerston which the Queen and the Prince Consort still entertained was another cause of trouble, which the jaunty Premier acknowledged and felt.

'They are determined to behave well and with confidence to him [Lord Clarendon told Lord Granville], but the old mistrust haunts them, and they suspect him as likely to make a sudden splash before they know where they are, and on grounds which it is difficult for them or for you to oppose him. There is no doubt that success makes him dangerous in these respects. As Sidney Herbert said: "He always wishes to play double or quits." We must do our best to keep both sides quiet. I have done my best here; but if a sore is established either here or in Piccadilly it will be a martyrdom to heal.'[1]

A severe accident caused by a fall from a dogcart soon after his return to England incapacitated Lord Granville at this time for more than a month from leaving his house, or pushing his views with the vigour which he desired in the Cabinet. From a couch in Bruton Street he was, however, able to ply his accustomed *métier* of the honest broker of rival ambitions and discordant views, and to be the mediator between the different Ministers and between them and the Sovereign. In a letter to the Duke of Argyll he carefully

[1] Lord Clarendon to Lord Granville, April 25, 1855. See Greville, *Journal of the Reign of Queen Victoria*, ii. 111.

summed up the situation, and expressed his agreement with the recommendations of Lord John Russell from Vienna as follows :—

LORD GRANVILLE TO THE DUKE OF ARGYLL.

LONDON, *May* 3, 1855.

'MY DEAR ARGYLL,—You peremptorily desired me to put my opinion in writing. I should have preferred waiting till I heard more of the opinions and arguments held by others, but being a bedridden wretch I do not venture to disobey you.

'A heavy responsibility has been thrown on those who have to decide the question raised by the Emperor Napoleon's proposition. Assuming that this new version of the Austrian proposal is concurred in by Austria and we agree to it, if it is rejected by the Czar we shall have the advantages which a character for moderation always gives. If, as is more probable, the terms are accepted by the Russian Government and peace is made, what will be the effect in this country? A small and not insignificant party will rejoice ; a larger number will feel relief ; but the general feeling will be one of disappointment and mortification. The nation has been lashed by parliamentary speeches, by public meetings and by the press, into the most extravagant expectation as to what we were to attempt and what we were to achieve. A proportionate amount of gloom was subsequently created by the failure of these hopes, by the exaggerated complaints of the conduct of the war, and by the systematic praise of our allies, and almost of our enemies, at our expense. As to the precise terms of the peace, excepting insomuch as they will appear in the Blue Books to be less than what H.M.'s Government thought necessary, I do not believe that they will create much more dissatisfaction than any other conditions which could have been proposed with any chance of success. Some will resent that Russia has not been completely humiliated ; all will regret that there has been a diminution rather than an increase of our military glory. They will be dissatisfied not at the terms of peace, but at our leaving off without the triumph which attended the conclusion of the last war. It is to be feared that this opinion will not be confined to our own country. Europe and America are well inclined to take our public speakers and public writers at their word, when they assert that in this war Englishmen have shown no military qualifications excepting great personal courage. These terms are not what we should wish, and it is probable that we shall lose some prestige by accepting them. On the other hand, are the terms in themselves so very bad? Are they not better than what would have satisfied us before the war, or even

before our troops left Varna? I still hold that we were right in June to order the expedition to the Crimea; but can we pretend that we are now in a better position than we were before the landing to impose our own conditions? We say with truth to Austria: "It is all very well for you who have been at peace to be satisfied with easy terms; we who have made great sacrifices require greater results." But Russia can hold the same language. Both parties have been playing at war, the most gambling game in the world. Both have paid an enormous price for card money. Neither has many points to score.

'Russia is prepared to make large concessions, and yet because on one point she does not go to the extent which might be desired, we are to continue a war which every day weakens the Power whose strength we are fighting to maintain. If the chances of immediate success were in our favour the case would be quite different; but can we honestly say as a matter of calculation, not of wishing, that we can reckon on success? The siege of Sebastopol has hitherto been a failure. We have generals whom we do not trust, and whom we do not know how to replace. We have an Ambassador at Constantinople, an able man, a cat whom no one cares to bell, whom some think a principal cause of the war, others the cause of some of the calamities which have attended the conduct of the war, and whom we know to have thwarted or neglected many of the objects of his Government. The French generals seem worse than ours; the troops before Sebastopol inferior to ours if not to the Russians. That portion of the army which is at Constantinople is already attacked by cholera. Are we ourselves safe from pestilence? Can we insure the *status quo* on the eastern coast of the Black Sea? It has been argued that it is better that Austria should not take the field. This may possibly be true as long as she holds a large number of troops in check, but what effect would the certainty of her not going to war have upon our chance in the Crimea?

'A friend of the Duke of Wellington quoted here to-day the strong opinion which he had heard more than once expressed by the Duke, that Russia was weak abroad, but utterly unassailable at home. Notwithstanding the weight of this judgment, I believe that if France and England continue to act cordially together, they will succeed in the long run, by great sacrifices on their part, and by exhaustion on the part of Russia. But it is not possible to calculate on such a joint continuous effort. It is not certain even as regards this country. If we make peace, we may probably be hooted from our places; but if we continue war, much of the weight will be thrown in the opposite scale. Grey, Herbert, Gladstone, Graham, Bright, and possibly

Ellenborough, aided by the pressure of the war budget, will soon make a peace party, strong enough to take away all appearance of unanimity in the country for a war in which the religious feelings and the material interests of the nation are not concerned. In France public opinion is unanimously in favour of peace. It cannot be excited in favour of any war, except a continental war on a nearer battle-field. The Emperor is the only man in his dominions to whom we can look. Putting aside the thoughts suggested by the crisis of last week, can we expect the Emperor to remain firm when he finds himself in financial and administrative difficulties, in consequence of our refusal to adopt the proposal which he has so strongly urged upon us? In the meanwhile the deaths of brave men and distinguished officers, falling in affairs which have absolutely no results, press upon us the duty of considering whether it is absolutely necessary to continue this war.

'I was at first strongly against the Austrian proposals. The reflections which I have put down and the modifications proposed by the French Government have made me change my mind. With sorrow and almost a feeling of shame, I give my vote for acceptance. I should hope that the explanations with Austria will be explicit; that it will be in our power to show that the proposition is half French and has been strongly urged upon us by the French Government. I should also hope that in the treaty, the Sultan's power to call in the fleets of the Allies will be left as unfettered as possible.

'Yours, G.'

It was not inconvenient that the Duke of Newcastle at this moment resolved to leave Parliament to its own devices, and to go himself to the Crimea in order to see things with his own eyes. The Duke might have been pardoned for thinking himself a sacrifice for the sins of his colleagues and predecessors quite as much as for his own shortcomings; and before starting he wrote a letter to Lord Granville, in which the bitterness of recent events was only too plainly apparent. He was sorry, he said, to see much going on *sub rosâ* which he thought of a very unfriendly nature to the Peelite members of the former Government, and more especially perhaps to himself. There were intriguers who thought themselves very clever and cunning, but they had not yet learnt by experience that, though he was never in a hurry to strike an enemy, *Nemo me impune lacessit* was his motto.

The blow would assuredly come, as others had before found, and though he would give ready support to the Government, he would not consider himself in any way called upon to spare those members of it who were 'ungenerous enough to try and exalt themselves at the expense of a friend.' He suspected a 'game to crush all Liberals who were not Whigs and that a resuscitation of Whiggery *pur et simple* was desired;' a greater delusion than which never, he said, 'obfuscated the brain of a politician.' Personal jealousy was the motive of this miserable feeling, which was very sad to those who had shrunk from no obloquy 'to cement the elements of a Liberal party which could govern the country.' He had himself been willing to give up the name of Peelite; and he could now only look forward to a Liberal Government very different from the present, 'which would not know the persons to whom he alluded.'[1] Having launched his thunderbolt, the Duke departed for the Crimea.

Meanwhile a hostile motion of Lord Ellenborough in the House of Lords had to be met.

LORD GRANVILLE TO LORD PALMERSTON.

LONDON, *May* 7, 1855.

'MY DEAR LORD PALMERSTON,—I hear that Lord Ellenborough is to give notice of a motion for this day week on the mismanagement of the war. He will divide the House, which at all events will secure a great debate.

'Evelyn Denison saw about two months ago a letter from Eyre, in which he said that he had pointed out to Burgoyne a very dangerous piece of ground, and had suggested that they should make a dash for it and connect it backwards with the English works. Burgoyne thought the idea worthy of consideration, but decided it was better to approach the ground in the usual way. A fortnight after the date of Eyre's letter, the Russians did exactly what he had suggested, seized the ground, the now famous Mamelon, and joined it backwards with their own works. Eyre may not be a great general, but there is a fair chance of his being so, which he will have no occasion of showing while he is under the command of England. I may be wrong in the particular cases, but some of these changes ought to have been made before the matter is seriously discussed in Parliament. When

[1] Duke of Newcastle to Lord Granville, April 16, 1855.

the question comes to be debated as Ellenborough, Grey, and Derby can debate it, in the discussion two or three dismissals or changes effected will be worth a dozen projected. I hear from different quarters that General Markham (the best of all), General Ashburnham, Colonel Lindsay, and Colonel Mansfield are good officers. Percy Herbert is well spoken of in the Crimea. He has studied his profession as a science. Jim Macdonald and General Evans sing his praises.[1]

'I know you do not mind being bored on these subjects, even if some of the suggestions are irrevelant or have been anticipated.

'Yours sincerely, G.'

On May 14, Lord Ellenborough brought forward his motion in a speech which, after condemning the conduct of the war, proposed to tender to the Crown the support of the House if a more vigorous Cabinet than 'the family party' which as he insinuated sat on the Government benches were formed to replace it. This speech, like all those which came from his lips, was one of great power and eloquence, marred, however, by the same faults of tact and temper which had already injured and were ultimately to terminate his career. Why was the country, he asked, to be anxious to have Lord Palmerston as Prime Minister?

'I recollect [he proceeded] sitting by the side of the Duke of Wellington in the House of Lords during the unfortunate difficulty between him and Mr. Huskisson, which led to the resignation of a portion of the gentlemen forming the Government. The Duke of Wellington was suddenly called out of the House, and when he returned he said to me: "That was Palmerston, who wanted to see me, to tell me if Huskisson went, he must go too." The Duke con-

[1] The Hon. Percy Egerton Herbert, second son of the second Earl of Powys, Quartermaster-General of the second or Sir De Lacy Evans's division of the army in the Crimea. After hard service in South Africa in the war with the Dutch Republics, he went through the whole of the Eastern campaign, specially distinguishing himself at the battle of the Alma, where he was wounded, and at Inkermann. He was one of the few officers who retired from the Crimea with an enhanced reputation, which he still further increased by distinguished service in India. He was created Major-General in 1868 and K.C.B. in 1869. He represented Ludlow from 1854 to 1860, and the Southern Division of Shropshire from 1865 to his death in 1876. He was sworn a member of the Privy Council on becoming Treasurer of the Household in Lord Derby's last Administration. (See *Kinglake*, vi. 66; *Sessional Papers*, 1855, ix. pt. 1, p. 43; *Dictionary of National Biography*, xxvi. 207.)

tinued : " I said nothing ; it was not for me to fire great guns at small birds." That was the opinion of the Duke of Wellington. The small bird might have grown to be an eagle. At all events he was the man of the situation, and he was carried into power by an impulse of individual admiration, so common in this country, and so soon followed by frigid indifference. . . . While the Parliament was torpid, however, the public were thinking. . . . Well, the people had come to the conclusion that it was time Parliament should state its opinion that the government must be conducted on the true principles of selecting men for employment in consideration of their means of serving the State.'

The present Palmerston Government, he went on, were nothing after all but the old Whig party, a set of near relations and one in which a particular family connection was specially prominent and powerful, and that family connection was represented by the leader of the House.

On the larger question involved in Lord Ellenborough's diatribe, Lord Granville had no difficulty in persuading the Peers that whatever their individual opinions might be as to the composition or the abilities of the Government, it was too soon to condemn them after only a few months' trial in office. In regard to the charge that the Government were a family party, he said he desired to meet it at once, as the same insinuation, though not so openly expressed, had been made on the platform. It had been said that ' we had gone back a hundred years in our history, and that the heads of the Gower, Howard, and Cavendish families sat in conclave and dictated to the Prime Minister the colleagues whom he should have.' Such was the cry ; and such sneers, Lord Granville replied, were an easy way to obtain a cheap popularity, which, however, ought not to tempt men of Lord Ellenborough's eminence. Further, the insinuation was untrue.

' My Lords [he said], I am a Gower, and I believe I am the only one of that family who holds any official appointment whatever. I am also a Cavendish, but I think that the noble Duke at the head of that family has not shown himself slow to encourage genius wherever he has found it. I find behind me the heir presumptive of that noble Duke, who did not shrink at the University from competition

with the ablest and best men of the day.[1] That noble Lord has not abstained in his private capacity from aiding the public in many ways; but to this day he has never held one single office; and as far as I remember, his only relation bearing the name of Cavendish is one who under the superintendence of my noble friend, the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, is fattening under the enormous emoluments attached to a place in the Foreign Office. My Lords, I am sorry to say that I am also related to some of the Howards: not "to all the Howards," because the Howards since the time of Pope have so wonderfully multiplied and increased, that I believe Mr. Horace Mann could handicap them very fairly in a race with "*all the Smiths.*" But I have yet to learn that the member of the Howard family who has been selected by the Queen at the instance of Lord Palmerston to represent her Majesty in Ireland, has either in that country or in any part of the kingdom been found inimical to the interests of the people.[2] My Lords, I had better make a clean breast of it at once; and I am obliged to admit that some of those who went before me had such quivers full of daughters who did not die old maids, that I have relations upon this side of the House, relations upon the cross benches, relations upon the opposite side of the House, and I actually had the unparalleled misfortune to have no fewer than three cousins in the Protectionist Administration of my noble friend opposite.'[3]

This good-humoured sally took the fancy of the audience, especially after the vitriolic onslaught of the mover, which had disgusted even his own friends. Lord Ellenborough's resolutions were easily defeated by a large majority, the sense of the House revolting against an attack on a Cabinet which it was evidently premature either to praise or to blame.

'*Gratulor Ellenbro titulis accedere vestris* [Lord Palmerston gaily wrote to Lord Granville next day]. Pretty well for a beginning. I only hope that our leaders in the Crimea may be as victorious as our leaders in the House of Lords. Pleasant dreams Ellenborough must have, and agreeable recollections on waking this morning.'[4]

The Austrian proposals were ultimately rejected, and the Vienna Conference came to a formal termination on June 5.

[1] Mr. William Cavendish. He was Second Wrangler and Eighth Classic in 1829. On January 15, 1858, he succeeded his cousin, the sixth Duke of Devonshire, who died unmarried. He already sat in the House of Lords as Lord Burlington.

[2] Lord Carlisle.

[3] *Hansard*, cxxxviii. 506.

[4] Lord Palmerston to Lord Granville, May 15, 1855.

Early in July, Lord John Russell returned. Although still as formerly an advocate of the vigorous prosecution of the war, he was more anxious than his leading colleagues to terminate it whenever it became possible to do so honourably; and in the proposals of Count Buol at Vienna he had thought that he recognised the basis of a reasonable settlement: a view in which, it has been seen, Lord Granville concurred. How far Lord John Russell, having as a British plenipotentiary expressed this view at Vienna, and having conveyed it to his colleagues, was subsequently justified in remaining a member of the Cabinet when it had overruled him, and in defending their decision as if it had been his own, will always remain a nice question of political dialectics, as it involves the question where individual responsibility ceases and the joint responsibility of a Cabinet can be substituted for it. But that in so doing on this occasion Lord John Russell had overstepped the limit of what was right and proper, was the view of the majority of the House of Commons in 1855, and his conduct was contrasted with that of M. Drouyn de l'Huys, who had at once resigned. Bowing before the storm, Lord John Russell retired. But, as frequently happens in such cases, a reaction began almost immediately. On the very day following his resignation Lord John had his opportunity, and he seized it. Mr. Roebuck had brought forward a motion to visit the members of the Aberdeen Cabinet with the reprobation of Parliament in consequence of the revelations contained in the report of the Parliamentary Committee which had just appeared. Lord John Russell at once declined to shelter himself behind his own resignation in the previous January, or to use it in order to protect himself from incurring a share in the obloquy attaching to the mismanagement of the war by the Aberdeen Cabinet. Public opinion had judged him severely for his sudden resignation in January, and it was for this former offence rather than for his performances at Vienna that he had had to pay the penalty. But public opinion now endorsed his action on Mr. Roebuck's motion as a partial if tardy concession to the sense of what was proper and fitting

in public affairs, and his return to something like his old popularity dated from that moment.

LORD GRANVILLE TO LORD JOHN RUSSELL.

July 20, 1855.

'MY DEAR LORD JOHN,—I cannot tell you how pleased I am with what has taken place this week. I ventured to mention the word "reaction" to you on Monday. My pet belief is that the further people go in a foolish direction, the more certain they are to come rapidly back to an opposite point. Your magnificent speech of last night seems to have completed what your calm and dignified statement in the midst of so much noise had begun on Monday.

'Yours sincerely,

'GRANVILLE.'

Whatever might happen as to the supreme command, which the Emperor of the French had by this time been induced to forego, Lord Granville was above all things anxious that the winter of 1855–56 should at least not see anything approaching in character to the *débâcle* of the winter of 1854–55; that time should be taken by the forelock, and that adequate preparations should be made at home to meet the requisitions of the Commander-in-Chief.

The Commander-in-Chief was now General Simpson, Lord Raglan's former Chief of the Staff, who on Lord Raglan's death on June 28 had been appointed temporarily to succeed him in the supreme command of the British army. There were those who judged him unequal to the task; but he had the advantage of enjoying the protection of the Secretary of State for War. Lord Panmure did not lack determination.

'It is all very well running down Mars' ability [Lord Clarendon observed], but there is no other single member of the Cabinet who can defy the Prime Minister, all his colleagues, excepting perhaps Charles Wood, and the Court itself: you will see that he will retain Simpson in command in spite of us all. . . . Mars, who is a much more wily creature than he used to be when he was so easily caught by a brother god, will slip through all our nets.'

To all criticisms of General Simpson he invariably replied, 'Aye, aye, all that's very well; but you'll see.'[1]

LORD GRANVILLE TO GENERAL HARNESS

LITTLEHAMPTON, *August* 12, 1855.

'I quite agree with you as to the *beau idéal* of the relations between Government and the commander of the English army in the Crimea, viz. a first-rate general with despotic powers which he is willing to use, foreseeing all that he will want during the winter, sending home by the electric telegraph requisitions, immediately complied with; but I cannot shut my eyes to what happened last year: 10,000 lost for want of communication; no requisitions sent home, which had not been anticipated, and the Government held responsible, and justly so to a certain extent. Everyone agrees that roads should now be made, the railway repaired, and certain sanitary arrangements carried out, not to mention field works, which may be required. I have heard neither officially nor from private correspondents, nor from the newspaper correspondence, that the army has not plenty to do. I have heard of no roads made, nor of the railway being repaired. I cannot doubt but what a large amount of labour is required. I agree with you that 2,000 sappers would be invaluable, and far better than any number of navvies, but when you talk of sappers it is clear that they are not to be had. Drafting 2,000 artificers from the army may be a good plan, but you diminish to a certain degree the fighting power of the small army which you have in the field, and which you would like to increase if you had the means, which you have not. The militia plan is better if it could be done at once; but it has this disadvantage, that you send out boys, whom Lord Raglan said died like flies, instead of sending the strongest, most skilled, and best seasoned men in England. I shall be very glad if Lord Panmure thinks fit to try both plans. I am sure we cannot easily have too much labour in the Crimea. I am sure he will wish the whole to be under the absolute command of the General.

'Ever yours,

'GRANVILLE.'

The relative functions of the Secretary for War and the Commander-in-Chief as to the appointment of Generals in high command in time of war had, it appeared, never been very clearly defined; but none the less it was certain, Lord Granville pointed out, that the Government as a whole were

[1] Lord Clarendon to Lord Granville, September 16, 17, 22, 1855.

ultimately responsible to the Queen and to the country for the proper selection of those who occupied the principal military posts. On the other hand, it would add much to the already overwhelming work of the Secretary for War, if on every appointment he was to be advised and criticised by each of his fourteen colleagues.

'Some of them, like myself [he noted], have no professional knowledge, and a very slight acquaintance with the army, and are easily influenced by the military gossip of others. The responsibility, however, of all of us is so great in connection with this war, that we owe it to one another not to be altogether silent as to the principles on which we think these selections should be made, and poor Lord Raglan's death gives a favourable opportunity for these considerations. Lord Raglan's appointment was right at the time. The praises which have accompanied him to the grave are his due, but there must still be a doubt whether another with more energy, youth, and genius would not have done more.

'It appears from the conversation of last night that the *Times* was wrong in announcing certain appointments as already made; and that the permanent or provisional character of General Simpson's command, and the nomination of General Knollys to be Chief of the Staff, are still under consideration. A question arose between Lord Panmure and Sir George Grey as to whether General Knollys was too old for the post, which it is proposed to give him. Whether sixty years is too old or not must much depend upon the individual, but as a general rule I believe that age within certain limits does not disqualify a man for employment to which he has been continuously accustomed, but does unfit him to bear a new strain of a novel character upon the faculties of mind or body. The marked superiority of some of our elder statesmen is shown every evening in debate. If these after their first two or three parliamentary sessions had retired to their country houses and contented themselves till this day with occasional appearances at the public dinners of a provincial town, would not some of their younger colleagues, with limited but more recent experience, have had a better chance of competing with them in the House? This is still more the case where bodily vigour is concerned. Assheton Smith hunted his hounds at seventy as well as he had ever done. There does not exist the man who could hunt hounds well in an inclosed country, who had for forty years contented himself with walking them out to exercise. The experience of the Crimea must give young men, such as Percy Herbert and others, a good chance of being a more effective soldier,

over men of equal abilities who have seen the last war, but who have passed forty years in the peaceable exercise of petty military duties. Where men have recently distinguished themselves in the late Indian wars, by all means send them to the seat of war, as it is proposed to do with General Markham; but while rapid promotion gives spirit and encouragement to an army in the field, the appointment of officers from home, whose chief claim is seniority, must have a contrary and discouraging effect.

'Speaking with great diffidence, I should recommend General Simpson to be continued in provisional command till we are better able to judge the stuff of which he is made, and I should give him assistance by promoting some of the best men now with his army, rather than send out General Knollys, whom I have heard mentioned as an excellent soldier, but who is not a young man, and who I am told is not in very strong health.

'Lord Panmure stated last night, none of the heads of the Commissariat are remarkable for talent or energy; that to find them it should be necessary to go low down. It is our duty to support Lord Panmure to the utmost in getting rid of merely respectable officers, and to do not that which is only good, but what is quite the best towards supplying the wants of the army for the future.'[1]

Whatever the merits or demerits of General Simpson may have been, the allied armies under his command and that of Marshal Pélissier took Sebastopol on September 8, 1855, and Lord Panmure now had the same answer ready which has been often given in regard to one of the most memorable events of the Peninsular War. Military critics have proved over and over again that Castaños had no right to win the battle of Baylen, 'for there disorder triumphed over valour and discipline, and inexperienced men defeated practised generals.'[2] To this argument it does not require to be a Spaniard to reply that this may have been the case, but the indubitable fact none the less is that Castaños won the battle which had so great an effect on the history of Europe, and that thirty thousand of the best troops of the French Empire surrendered to him. Lord Panmure was now similarly armed in argument against Lord Granville, Lord Clarendon, and the other critics of General Simpson, with

[1] 'Memorandum on the conduct of the war, 1855.'

[2] Napier, *Peninsular War*, vol. i. ch. vii. p. 111. Edition 1828.

the argument which admitted of no contradiction, that, whatever the failings of General Simpson might be, he had taken Sebastopol. Nor was he slow to use it. The irony of events further willed it that when General Simpson entered Sebastopol, he was accompanied by the Duke of Newcastle, who had just sent home an adverse memorandum on the whole conduct of the war, pronouncing the General incapable and the capture of the fortress next to impossible.

The Queen in 1852 had confided to Lord Aberdeen that she thought Lord Granville 'a most agreeable companion.'[1] He was minister in attendance in the autumn of 1855. The Court was at Balmoral, and it was there that the Queen received the anxiously expected news of the fall of the great Crimean stronghold. At half past ten two telegrams arrived, one for the Queen, and the other for Lord Granville. The first was from Lord Clarendon, with details of the destruction of the Russian ships as well as of the forts on the southern side of the harbour. Lord Granville said to the Queen: 'I have still better news.' Then he read the telegram from General Simpson: 'Sebastopol is in the hands of the Allies.' The scene which followed is described by Lord Granville in a letter to Lord Clarendon.

'Phipps and I [he wrote] had had a long walk, and not much sport after some grouse yesterday. I was trying to keep myself awake by arguing with her Majesty that it was better to receive commonplace messages by the telegraph which I could read, than to receive important ones in cypher which her Majesty could not understand; when the page came in with a message for each announcing the great news. You may imagine the sensation. The Queen rather upset and her first words rather curious. The Prince in the most extravagant spirits. Poor jaded Phipps and I had to rush up a precipitous hill after him, over some very rough ground, to light a bonfire, drink whisky, and say *urray* as like a Scotchman as we could.'[2]

Just at this juncture the memorandum from the Duke of Newcastle mentioned above, dated August 30, arrived in

[1] The Queen to Lord Aberdeen, September 5, 1852.

[2] Lord Granville to Lord Clarendon, September 11, 1855. Compare *Leaves from a Journal*, quoted by Martin, *Life of the Prince Consort*, iii. 359.

England, and was circulated among his former colleagues, who read his criticism and prophecies with mingled feelings, and perhaps in the circumstances it may be suspected not entirely without some malicious satisfaction at the turn of events. It took the gloomiest view of the situation, reflected severely on the incapacity of the generals, both French and English, and on the want of organisation of the English army both in administrative and military departments; and described General Simpson himself as 'mooning' instead of 'doing.' On this memorandum Lord Granville commented as follows :—

LORD GRANVILLE TO LORD CLARENDON.

BALMORAL, *September* 16, 1855.

'MY DEAR CLARENDON,—I have read the Duke of Newcastle's letter and Lord Panmure's observations on it. The letter does not, nor could it, show the Duke's good qualities, which I apprehend to be courage, perseverance, powers of labour, scrupulous habits of business, and much parliamentary practice and facility. It shows some of his principal defects. Parts of it are clumsy, parts of it tiresome, although upon a subject of the deepest interest to the reader. It was unnecessary in a report upon the state of the armies in the Crimea to drag in home politics, and the remarks, although partially true, show much soreness. The egotism is remarkable when he talks of "his titles, his fortune, and his position in the country." In a letter which he directs you to show to the Queen, he pays her Majesty a just and well-deserved compliment, in words which would lead a foolish reader to suppose that the writer never imagined the Queen would read it.

'It is some affectation to boast of not reading over his long letter. I will stake my "titles and fortune" that Newcastle has an exact copy of every word in it. But be that as it may, after writing such wholesale accusations against everybody and everything, he was bound to see that his expressions conveyed his own meaning.

'With respect to his opinions on men, I do not much trust his judgment. In this case it is clear from his account that La Marmora, who I believe is excellent, was attentive and civil to him; and Italian compliments would have their effect upon the Duke. It is probable that Pélissier treated him as a *Péquin*, and did not offer him a good place in the carriage and four. It is possible that Lord Aberdeen's prediction was fulfilled, and that the British army did not receive the late Minister of War with acclamation.

'Having, however, given all these reasons for receiving Newcastle's statements with some allowance, I acknowledge to have read them with sadness, coming as they do from a man of his calibre and truth. The result produced on my mind is that it is necessary as soon as possible to get rid of Simpson, and to separate our army as soon as possible from Pélissier and the French. You know how much the Prince objects to civilian opinions on military men, and that he dislikes sudden recalls. I think, however, that he is now of opinion that the time is come. I am sure Palmerston is of this opinion. It will be a pity if time is lost. The Emperor would be open to conviction about the advantage of separating the armies. I dare say you have already been at him about it. 'Yours, G.'

Notwithstanding the success which had crowned Lord Palmerston's war policy, his relations with the Queen were still not those of entire confidence.

'I think they are unfair about Palmerston [Lord Clarendon wrote] though he has done nothing to justify this since he has been in office, and I have given them abundant reasons to be satisfied that he is moderate and amenable. Like everybody else, he requires to be dealt with after his own fashion, and he won't bear to be *brusqué* or put down by *authority*. They don't bear in mind the total change that has taken place in Palmerston's position.

'He has no colleagues to fear or to upset; he has attained the object of his ambition; he can't act upon his impulses at the Foreign Office; he is more immediately responsible to Parliament than he ever was before, and he is proud of having, as he thinks, overcome the repugnance of the Court. The Queen, therefore, must not persist in thinking him the Palmerston of old. He has put off the old man and has become "a babe of grace." With his altered position he cannot wish to get into trouble, *but* he requires to be delicately handled.'[1]

If there were Ministerial differences in London about retaining General Simpson in command, there were also Ministerial troubles in France, and these troubles were dangerous to the alliance. M. Walewski, now Minister for Foreign Affairs, was again as in 1852 a source of anxiety. In October Lord Granville was once more in Paris.

'Walewski [he wrote from Chantilly to Lord Clarendon] asked me to take a walk with him in the park. He said he was anxious to have

[1] Lord Clarendon to Lord Granville, September 16, 1855.

a little conversation with such an old friend on the present state of the Eastern question, and that as such a conversation would have nothing official in its character, he would tell me precisely and frankly his own opinions. He said that he believed that peace depended upon whether the Allies wished to have it or not. That I was aware that the Emperor was inflexible on many points, but that there were others on which he was easily influenced, and that there were many parts of the Eastern question in which he would implicitly follow the opinions of the English Government. This disposition proceeded partly from his confidence in the character of the leading men in our Government, but also from a belief in the sagacity with which matters of this kind were viewed in England.

'The Emperor, however, had one fixed idea, viz. Poland. He was only persuaded after much difficulty, half an hour before he made his last speech to the Corps Législatif, to strike out a phrase about Poland. If peace was not made, and a new campaign begun, it would be impossible to prevent the Emperor from making the complete restoration of Poland a principal object of the war. As it was, the French Government would do as the British Government liked about it. He, Walewski, had proposed what seemed to be a plan, which the Russians might accept. Although a different name would be given to the provinces of Poland, and to those who governed it, very little real difference would take place, and it would only be a question of *amour-propre* for the Russians, while it would be very agreeable to France and the rest of Europe that the name of Poland should have been pronounced during the negotiations.'[1]

The French Foreign Minister next proceeded to discuss a number of details connected with the Black Sea, the navigation of the Danube, the position of the Principalities, the Bessarabian frontier, and a war indemnity. He begged Lord Granville, to believe that he had no communications with Russia; but still as an individual he had indirect means of letting them know that a first step from them would not be at once opposed; and if he only knew that the English Government did not dissent from his views, in that case he thought it was 'ten to one' that peace might be made this winter. He concluded by saying that the French Government would either make peace on the terms which he had mentioned, or would continue the war for greater objects, and

[1] Lord Granville to Lord Clarendon, October 7, 1855.

begged that Lord Granville would remember that peace was the one thing popular in France; that the French had been much pleased by the taking of Sebastopol, but that they had not been made more warlike by it, and that the only thing that could touch their 'Chauvinism' was the name of Poland. They would, however, stand by the Emperor, as had already been proved by the loans and other demonstrations of their confidence. He requested Lord Granville, in return for his confidence, to tell him what were the views of the English Government respecting all the points which he had recapitulated.

'I thanked him [Lord Granville's letter to Lord Clarendon proceeded] for having treated me so like an old friend, and said that, putting aside the question of indiscretion, and my not having any authority to state the opinions of the Government, I was unable to do so from the fact that I did not know what were the precise opinions of you, of Lord Palmerston, and of the Cabinet on these important and difficult questions; that it was clearly desirable that there should be very open communications between the two Governments; and that although it was unwise to make arrangements which anticipated the course of events, and that it was better to a certain degree to make the most of events as they arose, yet it appeared to me desirable that the two Governments should come to an understanding as to the general terms on which they wished either to prolong the war or make peace; and that I was sure that both you and Lord Palmerston would be ready to communicate with the French Government in the most frank and open manner at any moment, as they have always previously done.

'Walewski then pressed me for my own individual opinion. I told him that, although I had of course thought of these matters, I was not prepared to commit even myself to any decided views on that which required so much consideration. That I would, however, tell him in the same confidential manner as he had used towards me, what had struck me during his remarks. With respect to Poland, without entering into other European considerations, it was introducing a new element into questions already sufficiently complicated. Although it appeared reasonable enough to say to Russia, "Do that which you bound yourself to do by the treaty of 1815," the Russians had to answer, that whether they or the Poles had been in the right, a bloody war had taken place since 1815 between the Poles and themselves, the result of which had been

the conquest of Poland. The Allies would have to admit that it was to be a new settlement, and then I thought they would be hardly justified in proposing such an abortive arrangement as that now sketched out.

'With regard to the indemnity, I had never heard the proposition much discussed by statesmen in England. Of course we should be glad to get indemnification if it could be obtained, but that it was undesirable to propose it if it was unlikely to be obtained and if we should have to abandon it in the end. I was afraid that the details would be more difficult to deal with than he expected as to the government of the Principalities and the navigation of the Danube. That with respect to the third point my inclination would be very much more in favour of neutralisation than of limitation. That it was impossible not to feel that in our parliamentary debates the limitation proposal had been much knocked about. I concluded by saying that it appeared to me, if Russia was to offer to make concessions, and agree to ceding sufficient of Bessarabia to secure the free navigation of the Danube, would consent to good arrangements for the Principalities, would engage to make the Black Sea perfectly neutral, and would agree to what we should think necessary with respect to Sebastopol, and to the appointment of consuls who would watch over the execution of our treaties, it would be difficult for the Allies not to take such proposals into consideration. I was sure that my colleagues would wish to discuss any such questions as might be thought necessary by the French Emperor and his advisers, but that they would never consent to give the slightest sanction to any direct or indirect overtures being made at present from us to Russia. That I believed the firmer the language we held, the more likely we were to induce Russia to take serious steps for obtaining peace. That we ought in no case to open conferences again till the concessions of the Russians were clearly defined by them. Walewski professed to agree in all this, and said that he should wish to have a note signed by Russia containing all the principal heads, and which should completely and clearly define the mode of carrying out the third point. That when this was done he should prefer Paris as the seat of the conference ; he should not make any objection to London, but that he thought it would be necessary to take some small German town such as Mayence, as near the Rhine as possible.

'The impression left on my mind was that Walewski is dying for peace, that he has not the slightest influence over the Emperor, and that he would like to be able to say that he has not forgotten the country of his birth, and that it was not the fault of France that nothing was done for Poland.'

Notwithstanding all the assurances given by M. Walewski, it was not long before Lord Granville, who returned to England in November, was again hearing from Lord Cowley 'that Walewski had been playing tricks; seeing a Russian, Prince Lobanoff, who has been secreted in Seybach's house; and sending Seybach to St. Petersburg;' and at a Cabinet held on January 11, 1856, another letter was read from the Ambassador describing how he had 'warned the Emperor against the perfidy of Walewski and his advisers.' 'I think,' Lord Granville observed on this, 'that Cowley may go too far in this. I prefer King Log, Walewski, to King Stork, Drouyn de l'Huys,' whose treachery to Great Britain in 1853 could, he said, be proved from the very correspondence which the Emperor had produced in an interview with Lord Cowley in order to convince him of his own straightforwardness.[1]

[1] Lord Granville to Lord Lansdowne, December 21, 1855, January 12, 1856. Baron Seybach was Saxon Minister in Paris. As to this episode see Martin, *Life of the Prince Consort*, iii. 407.



CHARLES JOHN, EARL CANNING, K.G.
1812—1862.
From Drawing in Chalks by Geo. Richmond, R.A., in the National Portrait Gallery.

CHAPTER VI

THE PALMERSTON GOVERNMENT

1856

LORD Granville would at this time have called Lord Canning, next to Lord Ailesbury, his most intimate personal and political ally; and when he assumed the difficult task of leading the Liberal peers in the face of such opponents as Lord Derby, Lord Lyndhurst, and Lord Ellenborough, it was no small encouragement that the friend whom he had looked up to in Eton and Oxford days now sat by his side as a colleague. But a separation was impending. In 1855 Lord Dalhousie was terminating his long Governor-Generalship of India and was about to return to England. Lord Canning was appointed his successor. Rejoicing in his friend's promotion, Lord Granville none the less felt the coming severance of existing ties. The separation was made all the graver by the apprehension which existed in England, for which it was difficult at the moment to find an adequate or exact explanation—though only too soon to be justified by events—that the time of the new ruler of India would prove to be a period of no ordinary difficulty.

'I wish for a peaceful term of office [the new Governor-General said at a farewell banquet given by his friends]; but I cannot forget that, in our Indian Empire, that greatest of all blessings depends upon a greater variety of chances and a more precarious tenure than in any other quarter of the globe. We must not forget that, in the sky of India, serene as it is, a small cloud may arise, at first no bigger than a man's hand, but which, growing larger and larger, may at last threaten to burst and overwhelm us with ruin. What has happened once may happen again. The disturbing causes have diminished, certainly, but they are not dispelled. We have still discontented

and heterogeneous peoples united under our sway; we have still neighbours before whom we cannot altogether lay aside our watchfulness; and we have a frontier configuration that renders it possible that in any quarter, at any moment, causes of collision may arise.'

It was agreed between the two friends that they should try to maintain a continuous correspondence by means of a letter journal which each was religiously to keep up and post to the other. 'Mind you take exercise, and do not work too hard,' was Lord Granville's parting injunction. Lord Canning in reply seems to have suggested some mild doubts whether the versatile habits and numerous occupations of Lord Granville would be quite able to bear the continued strain of the virtuous intentions which had animated the agreement.[1] Lord Granville however confidently sent the Governor-General a pencil as a reminder that he had himself agreed to the contract on the one part, and expected his friend to carry it out on the other. He was soon afterwards also able to inform him that the Queen and Lord Palmerston had given him permission to keep the Governor-General informed of the discussions in the Cabinet.[2]

LORD GRANVILLE TO LORD CANNING.

BRUTON STREET, *August* 23, 1855.

'MY DEAR CANNING,—If the Governor-General is to write with a pencil, he must have a pencil wherewith to write. I have long reflected on what is the best sort; and it appears to me that the kind used by the two greatest men of this country, myself and the late Duke of Wellington, must be the one best adapted for pencilling State papers. I send you one; but I do not call it a *souvenir*, because I do not think we shall require any technical aids in order to remember one another. 'Yours, G.'

On his way to India, Lord Canning saw M. de Morny at Paris, who said what struck him as 'rather remarkable both in substance and tone.' The Austrian Government was about to address an ultimatum to Russia, the terms of which were under discussion. The powerful French statesman however 'declaimed energetically in favour of immediate peace;

[1] Lord Canning to Lord Granville, May 25, 1856.

[2] See below, p. 410.

declaring that we had done quite as much injury to Russia's power and prestige as was necessary—that he feared England was bent upon a war of *amour propre*.'

And so on; but he guarded himself by adding :—

'All France desires peace, but there is one thing the Emperor desires still more, and that is the English alliance. He will not only not allow the two Governments to quarrel, but he will not allow any coldness; and so if you insist upon *war*, *war*, we shall go on fighting with you, but it will injure the Emperor with the country, *soyez en sûr*.'

Nevertheless such utterances were disturbing. In Paris also Lord Canning saw Madame de Lieven, who, notwithstanding the war, had been allowed to return from Brussels to her old haunts in the French capital. She was doleful and meek—'not reproaching us so much as deploring our *acharnement*'—despairing of peace, but very inquisitive about the principal members of the peace party in England, and wishing to know what these various shades of peacefulness were.[1]

All through the winter of 1855–56 Lord Granville kept Lord Canning faithfully informed of the changeful ways of English politics and society and of the still more wayward ideas of the Emperor of the French and his advisers. Cabinet meetings were very frequent and a War Committee had been formed, of which Lord Granville was a member.

LORD GRANVILLE TO LORD CANNING.

LONDON, *November* 27, 1855.

'MY DEAR CANNING,—I felt I had so much to say last night which I could not say. You know pretty well what it was: I cannot yet realise to myself the fact that you are gone for so long a time.

'I have seen no one of any importance to-day. The god of love has circulated the important and novel intelligence that Ben and Baines have the key.[2]

. . . . . .

[1] Lord Canning to Lord Granville, December 2, 1855. See on these events Martin, *Life of the Prince Consort*, iii. 392, 393. Greville, *Journal of the Reign of Queen Victoria*, ii. 80.

[2] Lord Stanley of Alderley, President of the Board of Trade, and Mr. Matthew Talbot Baines, who had succeeded Lord Harrowby as Chancellor of the Duchy, became members of the Cabinet in November 1855.

'You told me not to write long letters. I am vain enough to suppose that you were not so much afraid of being bored in reading, as of my getting tired of writing them. I know my infirmity as a correspondent, and I am afraid that it is ten to one, as the gallant Windham says, whether I keep up a regular correspondence even with you, but the length of the letter would make no difference in this respect. I have therefore determined to have a box in my dressing-room, with a letter begun. I shall try to keep a sort of journal in it, which I will forward to you every fortnight. This is an act of real moral courage, as it will be disgraceful if, as is probable, I do not keep my resolution for the first fortnight. I shall commence a course of studies on the subject of diaries. There is an article in Disraeli's *Curiosities of Literature*, and I remember Louisa Hardy advising me to read Foster's Essay on the subject.[1] 'Yours, G.'

LONDON, *November* 28, 12 P.M.

'The house beautiful, the china of the softest paste, the wine exquisite, the Lord President rather drunk, are the principal facts connected with Edward Mill's dinner. This morning Ben fetched me to go to the Cabinet. He tried to look as if he had never done anything else. Baines also appeared. Clarendon thinks he may possibly be useful. The Chancellor was very ill. He got a sort of sanction to setting the County Courts right. I got leave to propose a very liberal Education Bill in the House of Lords. Clarendon then read all the last French news, which you will have learnt from Cowley. The whole Cabinet took my line about the Commercial Treaty and thought it most objectionable.[2] Clarendon defended it, but I think profited by the discussion, and the matter will probably never be carried very far. Walewski asks what we mean by the reservation as to the wording of the ultimatum. On this point there has been much discussion both this morning and after dinner. In looking at the wording we found the substance very objectionable as to the guarantees of the Principalities.

'*December* 9, 1855.—I forget how I was going to end my description of the Cabinet proceedings. We have had one since, when the despatch to Vienna was finally settled. We have agreed with the French to reserve the guarantees for future discussion. We insist upon the arrangement about the number of "Guarda Rivas" being embodied

[1] *Essay I.*, 'On a Man's Writing Memoirs of Himself;' *Essay II.*, 'On Decision of Character.' (*Essays by John Foster.*)

[2] Lord Granville was one of the school of economists who considered that commercial treaties, even if they lowered tariffs in foreign countries, were in principle opposed to free trade, as implying the notion that a country ought not to lower its own tariff except in exchange for a similar concession.

in the General Treaty, and we are now waiting for an answer from Vienna. I thought Cupid low and a little cross. Although he said nothing, he marked his displeasure very clearly to Mars when the last god first denied that he had ever heard anything about a telegraphic message being sent to Codrington about Kars, and then said he had forgotten all about it. We have been at Tavin, and had some good shooting. The house at Tavin is very bracing. The conversation constantly falling upon you and Lady Canning, the regrets loud and universal. I begin to think the appointment detestable.

'I read the greater part of your Paris letter to the Cabinet, who were much interested. Baines is gradually coming away from the door, which he much affects. 'G.'

LONDON, *December* 9, 1855.

'I went to church this morning. Brookfield read and preached, both well. I saw the Duchess of Wellington in the afternoon. She had had a long conversation with Skirrett, who told her that the Queen had been very angry with the Emperor. I have begun a Life of Madame de Chevreuse in the *Revue des Deux Mondes* by Cousin. It seems very amusing. I recommend you to take this review in. There is a very clever letter of Montalembert on England. I have not yet got it; but it is a defence of England against the belief now entertained on the Continent, that we have reached the summit of our prosperity, and are about to decay. It denounces Palmerston's foreign policy, but agrees with him in thinking that the foreign policy of the English is very much that of the Romans. He deplores administrative Reform as likely to lead to a powerful bureaucracy, which will be our chief danger. He is strongly in favour of entails, which he wishes to reintroduce into France. I have a great inclination to believe that there is too much liberty given to those who have property to bequeath in this country, while there is certainly too little liberty given to persons in the same position in France.

'*December* 11.—At the Cabinet to-day we heard that the Russians have proposed to the French Government through the Saxon Minister, to treat for peace, on a sort of limitation principle to be decided between Turkey and Russia. Cowley had received Clarendon's despatch respecting the ultimatum at Compiègne. Walewski thought our alterations inadmissible. The Emperor thought them, in a subsequent conversation with Cowley, *des améliorations*. Walewski has, however, since Compiègne, written, he says by the Emperor's order, imploring us to telegraph to Hamilton Seymour, that if Buol objects to our suggestions, he is to *passer outre*. This

we decline to do. We do not intend to give any answer about the Russian proposal until we hear what Austria says about the ultimatum. Mars then gave us his strategical views of the operations in the Crimea, and the Chancellor was poked up about Law Reforms and the Cambridge Bill.[1] Carlisle, the Charles Woods, B. B.,[2] and Evelyn Denison dined with us, so did Richelieu (who fortunately goes away to-morrow) and the "Lodger." Carlisle very amiable and agreeable. He describes Ireland as most prosperous; but intends to resign as soon as the first Bishop dies. Dicky Milnes came in elated after dining *en famille* with the Pams, the Shaftesburys, and Azeglio. His talk Polish and warlike.

'*December* 12.—A War Committee. Peel declares he will not let Monsell move all the estimates. If the god of war fails in persuading him, the god of love is to try. If both fail, he will probably be offered the Vice-presidency of the Committee of Education! Sir Richard Airey and General Jones met us, the latter looking ill and subdued, but very handsome and soldier-like. The former, clever and decided in his talk, is said to have made a great effect at Windsor. He is not unlike Pakington in looks, with a small head and narrow forehead. He did not give me the notion of a very able man, but I should think he was above the calibre of the men who are now at the Horse Guards. They describe the army as very young, in possession of every comfort which an army can require. They attribute the failure at the Redan entirely to the men. Jones says that if they had gone on in a straight line instead of diverging to the right and left, they would not have been exposed to the fire of batteries, which, as it was, enfiladed them. Hübner told Cowley yesterday that if he was Buol he should certainly accept the English alterations in the Austrian ultimatum. He begged, however, not to be quoted. Persigny says that Walewski is an "animal." "Ce n'est pas par méchanceté qu'il fait ce qu'il fait, c'est par pure bêtise. C'est une pauvre bête qui ne comprend rien."

'*December* 13, *Hinchinbrooke*.—At the Cabinet to-day we received the Austrian alterations of our amendment to their ultimatum. They were trifling, and we agreed to most of them; but Pam carried, against the opinion of Clarendon and some of us, an amendment on a phrase which the Austrians propose, viz. that the Porte should grant institutions to the Principalities, "with the consent of the guaranteeing Powers." Pam's phrase is, "in concert with the contracting Powers." If Austria refuses, which I think probable, Pam

[1] The Bill for the partial abolition of University Tests.

[2] B. B., Mr. W. Bingham Baring, succeeded as second Lord Ashburton 1848, married first, 1823, Lady Harriet, daughter of sixth Earl of Sandwich; she died May 4, 1857; married secondly Miss Louisa Stewart Mackenzie. He died 1864.

will, I feel sure, yield. It would be too ridiculous to refuse peace for such a phrase. We have no further news of the capture of Kars, although there was a rumour in the town that Williams had made his escape. Persigny has told Walewski that the whole English Cabinet believe that he is playing false. The latter is furious, and has demanded explanations from Cowley. He came here to-day. The Duchess of Manchester, the Jolliffes, Newport, Mrs. Hobhouse, H. Greville, and Tom Ashburnham are the guests; the house pretty and comfortable, as you know. Poddy would not speak to me, but kissed me behind the door.[1] According to the old French proverb, I was unlucky at play. I lost at billiards, at "the alliance game," and at chess.

'*December* 15, *Woburn.*—We shot a large wood yesterday, rather a pretty day's sport with woodcock. A very old man of the name of Tillard, a country neighbour, was one of the guns. He said he was at Oxford with me. Nothing remarkable in the evening. Sandwich thinks it was adroit, but very unprincipled, of Palmerston to offer the Colonial Office to Stanley. He doubts the latter being a good Colonial Secretary, and says that Lady Derby assured him that Stanley had refused before he saw his father. I went out hunting this morning. The Oakley met at Kimbolton. Such a desolate mansion never did I see. I rode on to this place in the afternoon. G. Byngs, Spencers, George Manners, Lady Hislop, Foleys, Otho FitzGerald very pleasing, Mrs. Dyce Sombre very odd. She pretends to have a siesta after dinner in her own room, but she told me it was all a pretence to avoid the extreme dullness of the early part of the evening. Major Rawlinson, Vernon Smiths, Mr. Lyons. The John Russells arrived, but could not dine, as they had left their clothes behind them. Lady Hislop thought that they would not appear in the evening. She was mistaken, for they both came down. I have had no talk however with him, and feel rather embarrassed, as I do not know what he knows about the negotiations. Somebody told a story of Hertford, when he returned to England after a long absence, during which time he had been neglected by his relations. Lord Robert Seymour spoke to him, and was asked in return, "Pray, would you have the goodness to tell me whether you are my father or my grandfather or my uncle?" Good night.

'*December* 16.—A dullish day. Church, a pleasant walk with my wife and my dog to visit Forester, who is improving rapidly in condition, and a long talk with Lord John, chiefly upon education.

[1] Lady Florence Montagu, then a child of seven years of age. Lord Granville's fondness for small children was a marked feature in his character, and made him very popular with them.

His views quite different from those of last year, all for extending Privy Council grants and creating innumerable inspectors. He has consulted three great authorities, and those only: Lord Minto, Melgund, and his brother George Elliot. He quotes the latter disagreeing to this, and declining to acquiesce in that, exactly as I might quote himself. He was good-humoured and moderate about general politics. I could not make out what he knew, so I told him nothing. He thinks that Palmerston will be hard pressed by able speakers, but that he has the country and Parliament with him. He infers from the *Morning Post* that Palmerston thinks the time is not yet come, but may come, for a war of nationalities. Johnny dreads such an event, but thinks the language ought to be clear on the subject either one way or the other. He is anti-Austrian to a certain degree, but now that I wish to inform you of what his views are, and to put them in writing, I find I do not know much about them. The President of the Board of Control talks a great deal about you, and always in a complimentary style.

'*London, December* 19.—We had a good day's shooting at Woburn on Monday. Neither Rapp[1] nor his master distinguished themselves. Last time I was at Woburn, I said to the Duke that his plantations were beautiful. "Unique," was his reply. I was determined to be even with him this time, and therefore said:—

'"I do not know, Duke, anything like these plantations."

'"No more do I," said he.

'I came to town early yesterday morning to attend a War Committee and a Cabinet, the first going over the estimates for fortifications, the second not very interesting. The Austrians have agreed to our amendments and sent their ultimatum, accompanied with instructions, which Hamilton Seymour telegraphs are good and firm. Will the Russians accept or not? If they refuse, we shall be a party upon velvet. I imagine we shall be immensely blown up about Kars, and I do not see how we are to defend ourselves, without showing up the Emperor, Pélissier, Simpson, and your much to be venerated cousin,[2] who is said to have rejoiced at the fall of the town because the Turks were getting proud, and required a slap in the face. We had a War Committee again to-day. Admiral Dundas appeared, and gave us an account of the way in which Kronstadt must be attacked next year. He says there are no two opinions among the officers as to the way in which the attack is to be made. The success of the attempt is of course doubtful, but it will certainly be

[1] Rapp was the name of a favourite dog which Lord Canning had left with Lord Granville.

[2] Sir Stratford Canning.

made next year. The Spider[1] says that if Napier had examined it at all, we should have been able to take it this year.'

LONDON, *December* 20, 1855.

'We dined alone last night. Lady Granville has taken a passion for chess. A card table is laid out for whist. As yet the amateurs are not numerous. To-day I spent four hours at the War Office. We went over the barrack estimates. Cupid hopes and believes that the Russians will not accept our ultimatum. That they will refuse, seems to be the general opinion. I afterwards went with Lady Granville and the Miss Pitts to Albert Smith's entertainment. I was late. One translation into English of the bill of fare of a French café amused us. "*Vol au vent à la financière.* A fly to the wind at the wife of a banker." Johnny Acton arrived from Aldenham this afternoon, grown fat, and much pleased at having to lionise a young Arco, who arrives to-morrow.

'*December* 21.—The weather is colder than I ever remember it, with a falling glass, and a bitter east wind. In the Cabinet an interesting letter was read from Miss Nightingale thanking the Queen for a handsome present, and discussing the causes and remedies for the drunkenness in the army. Pam thought it excellent. Clarendon said it was full of real stuff, but Mars said it only showed that she knew nothing of the British soldier. Murray has struck his flag in Persia, but not for political reasons: we do not know more. Clarendon read a long despatch from him of an earlier date, detailing the conditions on which Persia would make war upon Russia. "Officers, money, promises never to complain of the Persian Government, guarantee for all her present and *past* possessions." We unanimously rejected the proposal.

'*London, December* 25.—A happy Christmas to you both, and a great many of them. I sent you a short letter yesterday, but am rather nervous about some of my precious documents. One post day mentioned by you fell on a Sunday, before I had thought of the necessity of meeting that contingency overnight, and I believe that all your dates for the Marseilles boats have been a day too late. My news, however, will not spoil much by keeping. We had a family dinner yesterday. Poor Rivers complained of the intolerable bore of the picture galleries at Genoa; one picture exactly like the other. We asked Tissy Pitt how he behaved. "Oh, very well; he amused himself by measuring all the rooms." Judging from church and clubs, London was really empty to-day. I got a letter from Lord Lansdowne inviting us to Bowood, which unfortunately we cannot

[1] The nickname by which Sir Charles Wood was known among his friends.

manage. He says he has arrived slowly at the conclusion that Russia will reject our terms, and that Austria has not been in collusion with her. He knows of nothing in ancient or modern history finer than Macaulay's siege of Limerick. I have not got to it yet, but like what I have read (two chapters and a half) very much. I am getting nervous about the session. I have no doubt that a sharp attack will be made on the administration of the War Department. I doubt Panmure being able to meet it. I, as the only peer on the War Committee, ought to help him, and I do not feel that I am the least better able, in consequence of those committees, to do so. Derby will not wish to turn us out, but of course he will damage us as much as possible in order to prepare for a change after we have made peace. Grey announced to Francis Grey that he meant to fight with his gloves off. Newcastle I expect is bitterness itself, but he will try to support us. Somerset will not be able to resist criticising. Ellenborough will be great on Kars. Our whole case rests upon throwing the blame on others—the Emperor, Pélissier, Simpson, and Stratford Canning, who received 150 despatches from Williams before he sent any answer. But then why do we keep him? The great Norman [1] tells me that he knows from the best authority, I presume the Duchess of Hamilton, that some of the entourage are trying to establish a sore in the Emperor's mind, and that the points that have been selected are the contempt with which the Emperor's remonstrances about Stratford have been treated, and the continued absence from the Tuileries of Howden, which the Princesse Bagration told Clarendon was caused by the influence of Madame Odier (Mathilde Laborde) over him.[2] Persigny is gone suddenly to Paris. I do not know what will come of it. It is almost impossible that he and Walewski should go on together.

'*December* 27.—I saw Clarendon yesterday. There has been the devil to pay at the Tuileries. Of course Clarendon has said nothing to the Queen and to Pam about this. Cowley means to get an autograph letter out of her Majesty, to be taken to Paris by the Duke of Cambridge, who is to go with Airey and Lyons to the Council of War. Newcastle is much surprised at not having been asked to Windsor. I have had a civil letter from him, asking me to go to Clumber. *Ça me paraît une affaire un peu grave*, and I have declined for the present.

'*Trentham, December* 28, 1855.—I came here *viâ* Shelton to-day. The Duchess and the Argylls are just come back from a visit to Gladstone. More peaceable than ever but not sanguine about peace.

[1] Mr. Norman Macdonald.

[2] Lord Howden was living in Paris. The Odiers belonged to the Orleanist connection.

He is devoted to Homer.[1] He is going to *réhabiliter* Helen, whom he has discovered to be a much injured woman. I go back to town early to-morrow.

'*London*, *December* 30.—I came back yesterday with a bad cold, and was kept awake by coughing; my health probably not improved by a visit to the Olympic to see the new pantomime or rather burlesque in which Robson acts well.[2] Baron Parke is to be made a peer, not Lord Ampthill as was first said, but Lord Wensleydale, or some name like that, which excites the "Lodger," who intends calling on the Baron and begging him to call himself Lord Parke.

'The subscription for Miss Nightingale flags. The "Lodger" will not subscribe to it on principle. My two railway journeys have got me on with Macaulay. I am in the fourth volume. It is certainly charming reading. I cannot help thinking that his way of cutting up his sentences with full stops is a little tiresome in two long volumes, I have also read Montalembert's two Essays on the prospects of England. The first excellent; the second, which treats of our schools, our colleges, Anglicanism, Catholicism, &c., is bad.

'*Broadlands*, *December* 31 (or rather at the moment that I am writing, January 1, 1856). . . . We came down here this afternoon. Pam is in force. He thinks it even betting whether the Russians will accept or reject. He foresees one possible scrape. He does not know whether the Austrians have said anything to the Russian Government about our additions to their ultimatum. In either case he thinks it likely that the Russians will accept the Austrian ultimatum, but will reject our addenda. He gave me Clarendon's report of Persigny's visit to the Emperor. Persigny is come back triumphant. He accused Walewski before the Emperor of having risked the English alliance by his *gaucheries*, his *mauvaise foi*, and the *mauvaise rédaction* of his despatches. Walewski was feeble in his defence. The Emperor thanked Persigny for having saved the English alliance; the latter shook hands with Walewski, but would not call on him, and considers himself independent of him for the future. He also warned the Emperor of his own danger, and told him that no prestige and no throne was strong enough to resist the dangers of the "Maison Fould et Morny." He expects a *coup d'état* in the sense of morality. Persigny was authorised by Clarendon to tell the Emperor if necessary that Stratford would be recalled for the next fault. We had a bad dinner: food and company of the same quality. Pam retired as usual after dinner, to work as I supposed; Lady Shaftesbury thinks rather to sleep. I suspect you never bought a present for Mrs. Anson. Have you embezzled my 5*l.* note I gave

[1] Mr. Gladstone published his *Studies on Homer and the Homeric Age* in 1858.

[2] *The Yellow Dwarf*.

you in Berkeley Square? *Fi donc*, Governor-General. I wish I was near enough to insult you *vivâ voce*, and at the same time wish you a happy New Year.

'*January* 1, 1856.—I am come back from shooting, which turned out to be excellent, in a very pretty wood, knocked about in very pretty hills and valleys, called Nightingale Wood, after the bird, and not the neighbour, I presume. Lady Pam, *par parenthèse*, thinks the Nightingale Fund great humbug. "The nurses are very good now; perhaps they do drink a little, but so do the ladies' monthly nurses, and nothing can be better than them; poor people, it must be so tiresome sitting up all night, and if they do drink a little too much they are turned away, and others got." It was hot walking, we went fast, still Pam trudged along with wonderful energy. It was a bad feeling, but I was almost grateful when I saw him begin to limp a little. If I write too long, or tell you things which do not interest you, or omit things which I could tell you and would interest you, you must let me know.

'*Broadlands, January* 2, 1856.—I received this morning a letter written by you at Alexandria. As Lady Bessborough would say, it was much *too* interesting and amusing. What a voyage! and what a reception in Egypt, and what a swell you must begin to think yourself, and are. Pam, talking of you, says, "Ah, ah, a clever, sensible man that. Ah, ah." We have already at the War Committee had some conversation about Malta, and Palmerston has promised to-day that we shall have more. I like the letters from head-quarters at Sebastopol. It is evident that Codrington and Windham are very active. The former's letters are decided, and will I think keep Mars in check. Alas! for Pig's Marsh! I was childish enough to be much disappointed when I gave it up, and if my grief was aggravated, like sea sickness, no one would show the slightest sympathy.[1] Rapp has been behaving beautifully here. If you could have seen him to-day, put on the cold scent of a winged pheasant, retire for ten minutes, and then bring it with a countenance beaming with honest pride, you would indeed regret not having taken such another faithful retriever to share your anxieties and grandeur in the Far East. Nothing of interest here at Broadlands. When I told Lady Pam that Gladstone was determined to restore Helen of Troy's reputation, she said, "Well, you know, people used to abuse Melbourne because he said Mary Magdalene was not near so bad as she was represented."

'*London, January* 3.—The Cabinet was chiefly occupied with the instructions to be given to those who attend the Council of War. A clever memorandum of the Prince Consort's was read, concluding

[1] See ch. xvii. p. 488.

towards an evacuation of the Crimea. We all thought that out of the question. We think 30,000 men must be left to take their share of the defence of our lines, and the rest of the English army sent to Georgia. We propose sending a small force to Trebizond at once. We do not believe that Herat has been taken. Ben says it would be a fine beginning for you to annex Persia. Mars was very much at sea to-day: there was a strong feeling against him shown by his colleagues.

'*January* 4.—Clarendon, Lyons, and Hardinge attended the War Committee this morning besides the usual members. Lyons was interesting. He had seen the Emperor at Paris. The latter desired him to say that he proposed presiding at the Council which is to meet at Paris on Monday. He will lay before the members of the Committee every possible alternative, and endeavour to give no one any clue as to the judgment he forms. He will hear what everyone has to say, and he will then communicate to the Government of England as to the plan to be finally adopted. No one but those entrusted with the execution of this plan should be informed as to the nature of it. The secret must be kept if possible. Lyons then said that the Emperor had questioned him as to his views of the past and of the future. Lyons told him that he had implored the Generals to make a plan for the two alternatives of failure and success—that they never would make one. When he was asked by Pélissier what his plan would be, he said to embark an army the night of the success, land somewhere to the north of Sebastopol, and secure the whole thing. Pélissier invariably answered that he would not divide his army. The Emperor asked Lyons what were Pélissier's reasons. He said that they were his own *inamovibilité* and his jealousy of anyone else doing anything. The Emperor said, "Il faudrait donc lui envoyer sa démission tout de suite?" Lyons declined answering this question. Lyons is for a part of our army going to Georgia, the remainder with a portion of the French army guarding our present position, whilst the rest of the French army should do what ought to have been done on the night of the taking of the south side. He says the only thing which the Allies cannot do is to re-embark their army. He says that if the Generals had given him 25,000 men after the capture of Kinburn, Nicholaieff must have fallen. It will be a very difficult nut to crack next year. The Transport Corps is a complete failure, the army cannot march a mile. He believes the French and Sardinians can. He cannot conceive why we do not get more information from the enemy's camp. We have never had any, while Canrobert was duped by what he got. He says that Kars would have been saved if Omar Pasha had been got off in time. Not one moment was lost by the fleet when the

permission came from Paris allowing the Turks to embark. There is a good deal of Bourbon feeling in the fleet. Pélissier, Canrobert, Martimprez, and Niel were all for doing nothing on all occasions. Bosquet hated the siege, and professed to know nothing about it. Lyons believes he will be good commanding the army in motion. Cowley writes that he will probably succeed Pélissier.

'A new ingredient appeared in Bruton Street—Dr. Manning, a fine-looking, intellectual priest, with good manners and agreeable. I think I should have guessed that he was an Oxford man. He has a great admiration for Gladstone, and described him very much as you or I would. He was at school with Sidney Herbert, thinks him pleasing and quick. Newcastle he has a great respect for. He believes that one of the chief causes of the Church of England clergy having lost influence with the middle classes and lower classes, is their habit of writing their sermons. He says that it is not only less interesting to the hearer, but the preacher appears less in earnest, and is absolutely himself less careful in preparing his sermon than when he is to speak it. He says the artisans are a very sceptical and a very thinking race.


'*January* 5.—Lord Ailesbury is dead. Bruce was sent for, and galloped from Wilton [thirty miles] in two hours and ten minutes. He was too late. I am sure he will be more shocked than people would expect. Lady A. is much upset, and has asked the Bruces to keep her company in Tottenham House.[1] It is a break-up for her. We had another meeting at the War Office, at which the Duke of Cambridge, Sir R. Airey, and Sir Edmund Lyons attended. Nothing very interesting passed. I doubt whether our military plenipotentiaries will have much weight at Paris. They were told they were to consider themselves without instructions, but that they would do well to bear in mind that her Majesty's Government thought it would be disgraceful to abandon the Crimea, that it would be good to separate the armies, and that the importance of clearing Georgia was great. I urged a demonstration being immediately made at Trebizond, saying that it would be a great disgrace to the Allies if Erzeroum fell, as Kars had already done; that Rawlinson is of opinion that a winter campaign is possible for the Russians, and that there is danger of the Russians succeeding in insurging the population. I was supported by Airey; but overruled, not convinced, by the rest.

'*January* 6, 1856.—I called on your sister to-day. I wished her joy of her daughter's marriage. The wags say that Kars has surrendered

[1] The reference is to Maria, Marchioness of Ailesbury, who remained a well-known figure in London society for many years.

and so has Mag-de-Burgh.[1] Your sister seems favourable to the Government and very peaceable. She supports Stratford gallantly. Esterhazy has telegraphed that the terms are being seriously considered by the Russians; but Nesselrode has asked whether it is certain that no modifications will be allowed, and that the peace party is becoming stronger in St. Petersburgh.

'*Windsor, January* 8, 1856.—We had a pleasant dinner on Sunday. Fonblanque, Quin, and Ben, chaffing the Poodle, insisting on a dinner at the "Dog and Duck," and regretting that you were not present to partake.[2] Fonblanque made himself very agreeable, and gave Lady Granville a lesson in chess in the most clever way. In the evening an eccentric dinner, but not unsuccessful, Lady Levi and I having invited *chacun de son côté*—the Bessboroughs, Ben, G. Lewis, and John Stanley. Pam wished to make Gregg of Manchester and Marshall of Leeds, peers, they being representatives of the manufacturers of Lancashire and Yorkshire. I have advised Pam to make an offer of a peerage to Macaulay, who is about to leave the House of Commons—a good idea, eh? I met General Jones to-day in the street. He agrees with me, and thinks it would be a good thing to send 8,000 or 10,000 men to Trebizond, so does Lord Smith, so does Clarendon. So does not the Prince. The Queen is most gracious, but complained to Marie of my eating too many sweets. We have no more news to-day. The Prince is eager about everything: war, diplomacy, and science. He had invited the Ashburtons to come here this week, in order to pick B. B.'s brains as to his intentions: B. B. having announced moving for a Committee in the House of Lords on the subject of science applied to manufactures. The Queen says that B. B. is very civil to her, but never cuts a joke. The Princess Royal and I had only time to exchange a few ideas in gibberish, going to dinner. We then separated. The Comte de Flandres, good-looking and civil, is here. De Tabley and I condole with one another; he tries to keep up his spirits by a flirtation with Baroness Smith. Our dinner-table for the Queen's Speech is to be in this shape:—



Bessborough approves, but thinks people will say, "What an odd fellow that Granville is!"

[1] The allusion is to the marriage of Lady Margaret de Burgh to Mr. Wentworth Beaumont.

[2] Mr. George Byng, popularly known as the 'Poodle.'

'*January* 10, 1856.—The Prince sent for me yesterday, and kept me in his room without a fire (we are not at Madras) for two hours and a half. He was very agreeable, as he always is when talking on serious matters. He had read parts of, and gave me, a French book by "Vera" on German philosophy. He and Van de Weyer say that it is the shortest and clearest exposition of the subject that has ever appeared. The Prince attributes to the want of philosophical training the principal deficiency in English statesmen. They never look at any subject as part of a whole. He instanced the administration of the army and navy. Nobody ever asked themselves the question, "Why we wanted an army?" and then "What that army should be." He discussed the characters of several of our public men. He said that the only office which was creditable to England was the Foreign Office under Clarendon. That the *system* of not only the War Office, but of the Admiralty, was infinitely inferior to the French, while the conduct of foreign affairs by Clarendon had been more free from mistakes than that of any country in Europe. He likes Clarendon much, and thinks him very conscientious, which he had not previously done. He thinks Newcastle will support the Government. It snowed, and we could not shoot. I sat at dinner between Lady Hastings and Mr. Walpole. The former clever, but oppressive; the latter very pleasing and agreeable—took me for a great classical scholar. To-day we had a brilliant day's shooting. I believe 2,400 shots were fired at rabbits and pheasants. The shooting execrable. The Prince shot less well than usual. I missed literally hundreds, but got a great bag. The Spider's excitement round a rabbit was great. The latter could not turn half so fast. I was sent for just before dinner to sit in judgment on a draft despatch to Bloomfield, abusing Prussia violently, and ending by saying that her Majesty's Government no longer considered Prussia as a neutral country. The Queen and the Prince justly think this is tantamount to a declaration of war. Russia has sent her answer to Vienna. It will arrive there to-morrow. Nesselrode said to Esterhazy, "J'espère qu'on sera content de nous." Colloredo, who is here, feels certain of peace. We had theatricals in the evening. Moderate, but much enjoyed by the royal circle.

'*London, January* 11.—We had another good day's shooting at Bagshot. Turnour declares that Yelverton shot away yesterday nine pounds of powder, and killed three head. The Speaker was out to-day, and shoots as the First Commoner ought to do. The Prince consulted me about a letter which he had received and answered from a gentleman who criticised his Royal Highness's English. He then told me to consult Charles Wood. He and I differed, and

referred the points in question to Pam and the Chancellor. They decided in my favour; the fact being that the Prince's expression was slightly if anything wrong, the criticism on it perfectly wrong, and the Prince's rejoinder also wrong. Clarendon and G. Lewis could not attend the Cabinet because Mrs. Villiers is dying;[1] Mars is in bed with the gout; Lord Lansdowne is not well; Lord Smith is on pleasure intent. I had to read an interesting letter from Cowley. He has been denouncing to the Emperor the perfidy of his Ministers. Cowley may carry this too far. The Emperor gave him satisfactory assurances for the future, and read to him a private correspondence of himself and Drouyn, which proved the treachery of the minister and the straightforwardness of the Emperor.[2]

'*January* 13.—Panmure was too ill yesterday to have a War Committee; he has had gout in both arms and both legs. Ben sat between Tom Ashburnham and Maddock at the Travellers. They abused your predecessor: "the only policy which was his own was the Burmese War, a great mistake, he was disliked in India, and generally considered there to be a bad Governor-General."

'The answer is come from Russia. They accept the second and fourth points; they do the same as regards the third point with slight modifications; they suppress the fifth point, as also the last portion of the first point as to the cession of a portion of Bessarabia, substituting for it an engagement to give up the Turkish territory and fortresses in Asia for the Russian forts in the hands of the Allies. Buol is firm, and has told Gortchakoff that this is not an answer, and if an affirmative one is not sent by the 17th he must leave Vienna.

'*January* 14.—The Bear thinks it looks more like peace than anything he has yet seen. Pam told Ben that he considered the Russian answer was very nearly an acceptance. The "Lodger" says we ought to be impeached if we do not accept the Russian propositions. The next Cabinet is on Wednesday. Sweden has in the meanwhile sent to press for an offensive alliance. We do not yet know the terms, but it implies a subsidy. Clarendon is much afflicted by the death of his mother. Panmure is still in bed with gout. I saw him yesterday reading a book of Scotch divinity; very pompous and oracular on literature and politics. "Macaulay's History is not a history; it is merely pot-house gossip." "I am neither warlike nor peaceable, but I say that if we cannot have an honourable peace, we must have a bloody war." Henry Baring says that Cowley is said to have had a turkey at Christmas, but he cannot believe it.

[1] Lord Clarendon's mother, daughter of John Parker, first Baron Boringdon.

[2] This is the letter mentioned at the end of the previous chapter, p. 124.

'*January* 15, 1856.—Seybach has informed the French Government that the Russians are ready to negotiate with the Allies, and come to an agreement on all the points about which they are anxious, on condition that Austria has nothing to say to it.[1] It will be a curious position if we continue the war merely to please Austria. Sir John McNeill tells Argyll that he considers our Commissariat rotten from top to bottom, and that not one single recommendation of his has yet been acted upon. We had rather a pleasant dinner to-day. Dow. Rivers, the Charles Bruces, Rivers, and S. Pitt, Jem Howard, the "Lodger," Calcraft and Quin, the latter elated with a bridal dinner which he gave to the Peels, Abercorns, and Wellingtons yesterday. Quin and Calcraft[2] found out that they had known each other thirty-five years ago, at a time when the latter was smuggled into Rome by Princess Borghese without a passport in the disguise of her lady's maid. I went into the Photographic Exhibition, and saw there a dreadful coloured photograph of Lady Canning, dressed like Ophelia, with straws in her hair, and a white *négligée*.

'*January* 16.—An interesting Cabinet, at which Clarendon appeared much depressed. He wrote a despatch about a week ago to Sir Hamilton Seymour, repeating a conversation in which he had explained to Colloredo[3] why the British Government could not agree to the terms of an Austrian memorandum recapitulating what had been agreed to by the Allies. Hamilton Seymour telegraphed back that he hoped he need not communicate it to Buol. He was desired to do so. He telegraphed back to say that if he did communicate it, it would reconcile the Austrian Ministry to the Russian Mission. Palmerston and Clarendon telegraphed back that he must communicate it. This was perhaps unnecessary exactly three days before the Austrians will have to recall their minister from Russia for the non-acceptance of their ultimatum, as the despatch is only a record of a conversation, which Colloredo was bound to report to his Government. In the meanwhile Palmerston had telegraphed to Vienna to know whether the Austrians had communicated to the Russian Government our additional conditions. "No," was the answer. This certainly appears a mistake. Clarendon has advised Colloredo to telegraph to Vienna, that there is still time to repair the error, by owning that the Russians are right in objecting to a clause of which they do not know the meaning, and giving the explanation required. The Emperor of the French has written a letter to the Queen telling

[1] Seybach was Saxon Minister at Paris.

[2] Mr. J. Calcraft, father of Mr. Henry Calcraft, afterwards Secretary to the Board of Trade.

[3] The Austrian Ambassador in London.

her that she is the first and only person to whom he has confided his first impressions concerning the Seybach propositions. He describes his own position in France: "what the public voice will say to him; how it will recapitulate what he has done, and what Russia has conceded; whether he is going to greatly embarrass the finances and resources of France for the sake of a few marshes on one side of the Danube; he is powerful in France, when he is inculcating an opinion which he believes to be right; he is impotent when he doubts the truth of the advice which he gives; in the meantime, he holds but one language to all around him, that we must go on with the war." The Queen asked Clarendon and Palmerston to meet Prince Albert, who would come to London, to concert a reply. Clarendon answered that it would be difficult to get Palmerston in time, and that he thought the answer so important that the Cabinet ought to be consulted; but that in the meantime she might write to the Emperor, saying that she was always mindful of his position, and of the importance of what he had written, but that it was impossible to give any opinion till the messenger had arrived from Vienna. This her Majesty did in a well-written letter. I see I have omitted to state that the Emperor proposed to agree to Seybach's proposals that plenipotentiaries should meet to discuss certain points for only twenty-four hours, the Emperor wishing Brussels to be named as the rendezvous instead of Paris, and the Allies insisting only upon the Isle of Aland remaining unfortified, and two fortresses on the Russian side of the Danube being given up to the Principalities. The Cabinet decided that we ought scrupulously to avoid doing anything which could possibly bear an appearance of bad faith to Austria, that we ought to wait before we decide any new step till the second answer has come from St. Petersburg, and Austria has withdrawn her minister, in case of a second refusal, and that the Emperor cannot do better for the success of negotiations than to continue his warlike tone. Walewski will tell Cowley nothing, which does not much surprise me. The latter says that things are come to such a pass, that one of the two must soon go. Nesselrode's despatch in answer to the ultimatum is mild and conciliatory, but the Russians are frantic with the Austrians. Gortchakoff said in his own drawing room that they were *d'infâmes gueux*.

'*January* 17.—Lady A. eschews the title of Dowager, and adopts the more sentimental distinctive appellation of "Maria." The *Telegraph* announced to us to-day that the Russians have agreed to negotiate on the basis proposed by Austria. Londoners of all classes certainly surprised and pleased; the funds rose 2½ per cent. Pam apparently cheery; Lady Pam low; Mars says it has done him more

good than ten doses of colchicum. I think it possible that he may now carry his threat of resignation into effect. Clarendon is dying to be forced into going as negotiator of the peace. Pam does not like his going. I mean to urge it in the Cabinet to-morrow. We do not like the notion of Brussels as the place of meeting. Mayence would be better.

'Lady Granville and I went to a splendid banquet at Apsley House to celebrate the marriage of Sir R. Peel. Luncheon in the great gallery, short, and handsomely done. Some speechifying. The Duke brief, Lord Tweeddale simple and easy, Captain W. Peel broke down. Pam and I facetious on the bridesmaids, but not more than you would have approved. Ben dined with us alone. He says it is pleasant, whatever he does, to find a well-written phrase, either in the leading or money article of the *Times* of the next day, highly approving. He does not know what will happen when he and his Vice disagree. H. Bulwer came in the evening, Poodle and "Lodger."

'*Trentham, Staffordshire, January* 19, 1856.—The Duke of Wellington told Lady Pam that he had chosen two old stagers, (Pam and me) to propose and answer for the bridesmaids, because we should know what to say. A young hand might make *équivoques* which would have been very disagreeable. I have proposed to Lichfield to second the Address. He will probably refuse. I shall then go to Norreys; Gosford moves. St. Germains cannot dine with us on the 30th, but will vote with us on the 31st. "Has no Gladstonian crotchets, and means to support the Government as much as he can;" Minto ditto. Elgin and Somerset decline dining. Aberdeen, Newcastle, Buccleuch, and Grey have not answered. At the Cabinet yesterday we discussed the terms we should propose for the eastern coasts of the Black Sea, and it was settled to ask that none of the destroyed forts should be rebuilt, nor any new ones constructed: free commercial intercourse with the whole coast, and to try for some treaty of peace with the Circassians. The last point is absurd and cannot be maintained. With what organ of the Circassians could such a treaty be made? Clarendon will negotiate the Treaty at Paris. I hear the Russian plenipotentiaries will be Orloff and Brunnow. We brought the "Lodger" here yesterday; Chich and Lady Waldegrave, Cheneys, Sneyd, Sir Harry Smith and his Spanish lady,[1] Lord Robert Clinton, and Ellesmeres. . . . Let me graze your ear with an anecdote, as Lord Manvers says. Lady —— bought some emeralds at Castellani's, and

[1] Sir Harry and Lady Smith. The latter was a Spanish lady. (See the recently published *Memoirs of Sir Harry Smith* for an account of their marriage under romantic circumstances.)

said, "Oh, je compte laisser mes hemerrhoides à Lady Westminster." "Somebody was so anxious to see her that he came all the way to Rome *bas ventre*." She told some one else that "Io parlo cinque langue perfettamente e due passabelmente." . . .

'*January* 20.—Lichfield refuses, but is cordial in his expressions about Pam and his Government. Ben writes that people in London are much less sanguine about peace. I cannot believe in the continuance of war, after so much is agreed to on all sides. Russia will yield if France is faithful to us, and we must yield if France throws us over. A good many anecdotes to-day from Sneyd and Cheney, but I forget them all, and suspect that none are new. A smart saying was quoted of Ellesmere. There is a large Perseus in bronze at the end of the garden, holding a Medusa's head turned towards Trentham. Ellesmere was asked why it had been placed there. "I suppose to turn the house to stone." You remember that the old house is of plaster.

'*January* 23, *London*.—We had a Cabinet to-day. The despatches from Ch. Murray have arrived, so voluminous that no one but Hammond has yet read them.[1] Vernon Smith says that Murray's letters to the Shah are singularly offensive. His demands are quite absurd; yet orders are to be sent to occupy the island whose name I forget in the Persian Sea.[2] G. Lewis and I objected, but were overruled.

'Austria has positively declined to have anything to do with communicating our extra conditions under the fifth point to Russia. The Emperor of the French says that he is in honour bound to the Austrians to sign the preliminaries of peace at once, but that he is willing to enter into an agreement with us that the non-fortification of the Aland Islands shall be a *sine quâ non* in the subsequent negotiation. Clarendon is to write that we must have an agreement with France as to the eastern coasts of the Black Sea being considered, and the non-fortification of the Aland Islands being *sine quibus non* in negotiation, and that we are bound in fairness to inform Russia of this agreement, before we proceed to sign preliminaries. The Queen has approved of Clarendon and Paris. The Emperor and Walewski are much pleased with the selection of the place. I believe it will all come right at last.

'*January* 24, 1856.—The funds very buoyant. I have seen nobody but Lewis, who is indignant about the intended demonstration in Persia. He says it is Don Pacifico over again. He has promised me 40,000*l.* additional grant for educational purposes, so we may extend our capitation grants from the rural to the town districts.

[1] Sir Charles Murray was Minister to Persia.

[2] The island of Karakh.

No Peelite dines with me excepting officials, Shaftesbury and Ashburton. Graham has written a letter full of civilities to the Government. Gladstone is said to be quiescent. Lord John has written to Wood expressing his approbation of Clarendon going to Paris, and praising him to the skies. This has produced a reconciliation between the two. As Forester may break my neck to-morrow with Bessborough, whose hounds meet at Slough, I send the letter off this night. If anything turns up to-morrow morning, I will open it and let you know. 'Yours, G.'

LONDON, *January* 26, 1856.

'At the Cabinet the news produced by Clarendon was satisfactory. France agrees to announcing to Russia the private conditions, and to a *secret* agreement that she will make Aland and the consideration of the eastern coast of the Black Sea *sine quibus non*. We agree to the Russian proposal as to the mode of commencing negotiations, viz. the signing a protocol at Vienna describing what has been agreed, and a meeting of plenipotentiaries at Paris within three weeks to sign preliminaries, arrange an armistice, and negotiate a general treaty.

'At an Education Committee I got my two Education Bills and an extension of our capitation grants to all parts of the country approved.[1] In Belgravia it is asserted by the newspaper boys that the Emperor of Russia has abdicated, and Constantine been declared successor.

'*London*, *January* 30.—The box in which this letter has been kept has been out of my reach. This cause, and not idleness, has prevented my writing during the last few days. On Sunday, after taking Henry Lennox to hear Brookfield at John Street, the service of which chapel he thought dry and too Protestant, I walked with him a little way. It is evident that nothing can be more unsettled than the state of the Tory party. Henry says that the Carlton is becoming peaceable. Dizzy told Charles Greville that he never stood better with his party, that is to say the best part of them, than at present. He told him that Derby was a very clever man, but devoid of judgment, and under the influence of such as Malmesbury and others. Derby, in the presence of Norman, threw down the *Press*, and said he supposed that paper had done harm enough. All seems to confirm Strangford's (G. Smythe's) prediction to Bessborough that the Tory party would not exist in six months. I look upon this as anything but an advantage for us or for the country. In the afternoon we went to Frognal, Lady Granville and I. She thinks

[1] See ch. xv. p. 421.

Cardinal a dangerous beast. I came up on Monday for the Cabinet. Everything apparently smooth for pacific negotiations, but bad news from America. The Government has insisted upon the recall of Crampton.[1] We, of course, must decline. I do not see how we shall avoid a diplomatic rupture, which will do harm to trade, and have a bad influence at the Congress of Paris. Yesterday we had an interesting council of war, in which George Grey and I came to the conclusion that our generals could not have had much influence at the council of war held at Paris. The plan agreed upon will keep us as a contingent of the French army in the Crimea. I greatly doubt our getting to Asia Minor during the whole summer, if peace is not made. We had a pleasant Sheriffs' dinner, but thinly attended in the evening. A very foolish bullying article in the largest type of the *Morning Post* has appeared this morning about American affairs. I am determined not to be a party to such a line in the House.

'*January* 31.—Palmerston told me this morning that Clarendon had complained of an article in the *Morning Post*. "He (P.) had been too busy lately to read the papers"!'

[1] On May 28, 1856, Mr. Crampton, the British Minister to the United States, had to retire. A controversy had arisen in regard to the Foreign Enlistment question. See Martin, *Life of the Prince Consort*, iii. 493.

CHAPTER VII

LORD GRANVILLE'S CORRESPONDENCE WITH LORD CANNING

1856

MEANWHILE Lord Canning was on his way to India. At Malta he received a warm letter from Lord Granville bidding him at least to be assured of this: that if troublous times, nay, even if disaster overtook him in India, there would always be staunch friends to stand by him at home, and an undiminished place in their affections awaiting him on his return. The letter came opportunely, for at Malta Lord Canning had just seen Sir Henry Pottinger, living in retirement and bearing, in addition to the load of bodily infirmities, the more painful burden of soreness and mortification at neglect of his services in India by the Government, and, as he considered, of unjust blame. Was such, perhaps, Lord Canning had asked himself, to be the termination of his own career?[1]

In Egypt a contrast awaited him. There he found Said Pasha in the full blaze of the ephemeral glory of a Government based on the results of oppression, taxation, and foreign loans. At Cairo the Pasha lodged him and his suite

'in a gorgeous palace close upon the Nile with a garden to the river: on the ground floor a large marble hall about the size and height of a tennis court, a dining room, ugly enough, and a charming marble horse-shoe shaped vestibule, looking upon the garden, with a fountain in the middle and a divan round the wall. Upstairs [Lord Canning wrote] there is in the centre a large saloon, which we amused our-

[1] December 15, 1855.

selves with measuring and examining whilst waiting for dinner the first day. It is 155 feet long by 60 wide, lighted by three chandeliers, each big enough for a minor theatre, and numberless branches and candelabra, to the extent in all of about 680 candles, every one of which some ten or twelve zealous Nubians were proceeding to light when we first arrived. But we could not stand it, especially Lady Canning, and they were begged to confine themselves to a few upon the tables, for this is only the passage room out of which the living and bedrooms open. Of these, four are drawing rooms as large as any in Buckingham Palace, and the rest bedrooms and their accessories. All are furnished after the same fashion, that is, overloaded with large glasses and heavy gold frames, consoles, clocks, and bronzes, the taste abominable, but many of the things, especially the silks and the bronzes, really good; all, too, swarming with candles to match the saloon, and which it is equally difficult to prevent the Nubians from lighting as soon as it begins to grow dusk.'[1]

At Aden a letter was delivered to him from the retiring Governor-General, composed under the influence of apprehensions only too soon to be fulfilled. 'This will meet you at Aden,' Lord Dalhousie wrote. 'You must excuse me if I confess to feeling a small shock on writing those words, and if in addressing you within "the Indian limits" I feel as a Scot must do when he first sees his own wraith.' 'I do not wonder, on the contrary, I entirely understand it, in his case,' was Lord Canning's observation. 'Nevertheless I have not the most distant apprehension of finding myself the inheritor of the sentiment whenever my day shall come.'[2] And with a comparatively light heart he continued his journey, arriving at Calcutta in March, after calling at Bombay and Madras on the way.

'Two things [he wrote to Lord Granville soon after his arrival] are making me uncomfortable in the distance. One the state of Indian finances, not so much immediate as prospective. It appears to me more certain the more I see, that the revenue for years to come is pledged for particular works and items of expenditure, either absolutely or by implication, and that the very best we can hope for is ability to perform these promises, without any chance of margin for new works of improvement. I am very anxious to hear Dalhousie upon this chapter (for nothing sure can be learnt here of the conditions or

[1] December 16, 1855. [2] January 20, 1856.

doings of the Supreme Government), and I shall be agreeably disappointed if he can put things in a brighter light. The other is, that I do not see my way to getting exercise pleasantly. I have ceased to believe in the practice of morning rides before the sun is up—I am sure that it will exhaust and prostrate one for the rest of one's long day. And the only alternative is to ride from half past six to half past seven P.M.; but it is difficult enough to be sufficiently cool for dressing, and, after dressing, for dinner, without taking exercise just before those ceremonies. I don't see my way out of the dilemma, and I am afraid it will puzzle even Meryon.'[1]

The arrogance of some of the military officers who came out from England was another weak point which he could not fail to notice. They laughed at the Company's army in public and spoke of the natives as 'niggers.' One in particular he described: a man in high command:

'injudicious in his dealings with the Indian military authorities—abusing the troops almost virulently at every turn—telling the members of Council and military secretaries of Government that he never sees an Indian sentry without turning away from disgust at his unsoldier-like appearance, and favouring the Queen's troops to the disadvantage of the sepoys.'[2]

Here were future causes of trouble enough. But there were others. Many aspects of the education forced upon the native students were repugnant to him, and he considered unwise.

'The course [he wrote] in which education is running in each Government is by no means the same. In Bombay it is mainly supported and in some part conducted by the natives, aided by the Government with money, superintendence, and assistance; they have even gone the length of introducing female education in schools for their own children. In Madras the share taken by the Government is about the same, but the natives have only established two schools, and the labouring oar is in the hands of the missionaries, whose energy, in spite of much flagrantly bad judgment, has done wonders. It was strange enough at Bombay to hear Parsees and Hindoos (of converting whom there was no question) pass a good examination in Butler's *Analogy*—though, strictly speaking, there need be no inconsistency in their doing so; but it was revolting when (as we saw yesterday) a Free Kirk missionary, with a sanctimonious vocabulary, called up a

[1] February 23, 1856. [2] June 3, 1856.

high-caste Hindoo youth, and asked him to name some of his fellow-pupils who "had followed Jesus," then bid him say whether he had ever heard of anyone being unhappy who had "embraced the sweet Gospel," and put to the class generally questions upon the truths and "loveliness" of the Bible which they could only answer (in his sense) by asserting that which according to their professions was false, directly or impliedly; for they are not taught to answer such questions by stating what the belief of Christians is, but as from themselves and of their own convictions. This took place in a school of about 500 in all—amongst whom there were perhaps 20 (including native teachers) who had been converted. There is no disguise (as you may suppose) of the desire and intention to convert as many as possible; but paving the way to it by such thumping lies cannot give a thinking native youth—and there are plenty of them—much respect for our practice. It is strange, however, how indifferent most of the natives—even the older ones—appear to be to the inroads upon their faith; every now and then a batch of conversions, or the ceremony of the baptisms, will throw the community into a little ferment, and reduce the numbers of the scholars for a time, but it is soon forgotten; and I believe that heads of families, and men of wealth and good position, are generally persuaded that their grandsons, if not their sons, will renounce their religion for Christianity, and are not at all distressed at the thoughts of it. But at present, for some time to come, it is probably a vague lazy infidelity that will most gain ground, and form a transition state.'[1]

The load of work was also immense, and there was too much centralisation, even if for the moment it had to be endured.

'I don't dispute Macaulay's dictum about Governors-General [he wrote]. The fault of doing too much is one very easy to fall into; and all great administrators, from Queen Elizabeth to Napoleon, have succeeded quite as much by their wise choice of instruments, as by the work of their own brains. But that doesn't make it the less necessary that a new Governor-General should be little better than a galley slave. Quite apart from writing, composing, commenting, and minuting, excess of which is the vice of Indian government, there are such innumerable matters crowding up each day for his decision (be it ever so curtly given), and matters upon which, as long as there is a Governor-General, nobody but him ought to decide, that the shortest perusal of the history of each case leaves little leisure for going deeply into any. And as many great questions come up which cannot be understood at

[1] February 20, 1856.

first without deep research, the pile of business soon mounts up. The secretaries (five: Political or Foreign, Home and Education, Financial, Military, Public Works) are excellent, really first-rate men; and if they were not so, and were not as willing as they are good, the work would be impracticable. Edmonstone (Foreign) is the ablest; then Beadon (Home), a relation of Mrs. Sid. H.; then Colonel Baker (Public Works); the other two, Lushington (Finance) and Colonel Birch (Military), are safe and clear, rather than clever; but I should be sorry to change a man of them. They get very good work, too, out of their offices, and the lucid, faithful, and judicious way in which a heavy case is précis'd is admirable. But many, very many, matters do not admit of being so dealt with, and until I have got pretty well acquainted with the history of each department, in other words, with the history of India in its details, for the last few years, I do not foresee much diminution of labour. But it is, of course, enormously interesting, and becoming more so, and much more agreeable, as the current of events becomes clearer to one's apprehension. Dalhousie, though he did more than was necessary in some matters, made business shorter and smoother by one very judicious change. The ordinary course, for matters not dealt with by the Governor-General singly, is that the papers upon any case are circulated amongst the Governor-General and five members of Council, according to their precedence. Each writes his opinion: the opinions may differ, and the secretary may therefore not be able to deduce clear instructions from them; in former times the papers were in that case re-circulated, and as a natural result counter-minutes, répliques, and rejoinders were bandied backwards and forwards, to the waste of everybody's time, the loss of temper, and the stoppage of business.

'Dalhousie established a rule that there never should be more than one minute or opinion recorded by each member, or that, at all events, before recording a second the case should, upon the appearance of a difference of opinion, be discussed verbally at the weekly council, where, in practice, an agreement is infallibly come to. It was an excellent change, as the old records show. Friday is the Council day, but I occasionally send for a member of Council if I wish to see him on other days, and the secretaries I always require two or three times in the course of the week. At the Council on Friday each secretary in succession comes in, bringing with him the papers upon which any difference of opinion has been noted, or in dealing with which the instructions do not seem to him sufficiently clear or full. The Governor-General and the five members of Council sitting at a round table, and talking over each matter very pleasantly, but with a deference to the Governor-General and an unpleasant

expectation that he should give his opinion first upon some abstruse point of which he knows nothing, which I could sometimes dispense with.'[1]

What would be his own relations with the Government and the Board of Control Lord Canning did not feel sure. 'The more I read, hear, and think of what I have myself seen,' he wrote, 'the more apprehension do I feel of the dull dragging weight of official slowness at Home;' though he liked his immediate chief, Mr. Vernon Smith, whom it was the fashion to underrate, but feared that he might be tempted into throwing his influence into the scale of an aggressive policy in Afghanistan.[2] There was trouble brewing in Persia, and the great object, Lord Canning thought, should be to circumscribe the area of disturbance, and if Persia had to be attacked, to attack it from the sea coast, and not to send a force across the mountains.

'I should like Vernon Smith all the better [he wrote] if I felt sure that he would support the Governor-General's views as though they were his own, but I am not inspired with any confidence that this will be done. I beg and implore you to save the Government from folly—worse than folly—and India from its consequences. I have written to Vernon Smith fully (twice in December and once in January), and this mail takes home an officially recorded opinion on the subject. I know that there is a fear at the India House that the Government are going to do as Hobhouse boasted he had done, and dictate from London what the Government of India shall do in Afghanistan.[3] I cannot believe it; but it forces me into this exhortation. I had a letter from Argyll two mails ago, in which he declared himself a heretic as regards any fears for India on the side of Central Asia. I am not that. This question, like many others, seems to divide opinions into two extremes, in neither of which lies the truth: one that every change of rulers or parties in Central Asia, and especially at Herat, is of vast and immediate importance to us, and that if against our influence, or in favour of that of Persia or Russia, it must be redressed at any cost; the other, that we may sit quiet behind our frontier, and care for nothing that happens beyond it. I think that both are mistaken. So far as open aggression is concerned, I believe that many generations will pass away

[1] April 2, 1856. [2] January 20, 1856.

[3] In 1838, at the time of the first Afghan War, Sir John Cam Hobhouse, afterwards Lord Broughton, was President of the Board of Control.

before a Russian army can be a source of reasonable alarm to India. I do not think that any man can foretell the time when a force large enough and well enough appointed to be formidable to us will be able to cross from the Russian frontier to that of India in a state of efficiency and organisation; and a small force need not concern us. But that Russia is advancing towards us—that she has now (within the last four years) planted her foot on ground which is of very little value to her except as bringing her influence nearer to our border—that when next we are at war with her she will use that influence—though not her arms—to harass and annoy us—and that she may succeed in this to a degree which will prove embarrassing not only upon our frontier, but within our settled territories—all this is either matter of fact already, or surely to be expected. Bokhara is openly friendly to Russia. Khiva is threatened by the Russians and bullied by Bokhara. Khokand has been encroached upon by the establishment of a Russian post on the Jaxartes, and there are signs of the encroachment being pushed farther.[1] I have no doubt that if Russia has an opportunity of playing the same game in Afghanistan, it will be followed up there also; and it will be a grievous mistake to sit still and leave the field open to her, however true it may be that an army sent from Russia cannot hurt us. The question is how to fend off her influence for mischief whether at Herat or elsewhere. I believe that to do so by force of arms is not only impossible, but that the attempt would produce an effect exactly contrary to that which we desire.

'We can, no doubt, march to Herat, turn out the Russians, and put in a chief of our own choosing. But where is the man? I know none whose possession could be expected to be stable—none who has a strong party at his back; and to set up a weak ruler would be to play the game of Persia—or Russia—and to invite a renewal of the intrigues and villanies which have always been the first devices of the Persians in Central Asia, and which would be at work from the moment our troops had turned their faces homewards. Are we to march back again as soon as the Persian party (and there is a strong one amongst the western Afghans) carry the day? Is the same process to be repeated as often as Persian interests prevail? If not, is it reasonable, or consistent, to adopt it now? I believe that if we are to stick to the doctrine that Herat is to be independent, no other course will be open to us; but I would abjure that doctrine, and leave Herat as open to the Ameer of Cabul as to any other

[1] The allusion is to the capture in 1853 by the Russians of Ak-Mesjid, or the White Mosque, on the Jaxartes. (On these events see Sir Henry Rawlinson's *England and Russia in the East*, ch. iii. p. 171).

Afghan. Our admission in Shiel's agreement with the Persian Government that it ought not to be so, was a very great mistake ; as also, in my opinion, has been the desire hitherto entertained to see the Afghan power weak and disunited. From the day that the Afghans lost Peshawur and the plains on the Indus, and were shut up behind their own mountains, it was our true interest that they should be strong. Their strength can do us no mischief—not more, certainly, than is already done by the Border tribes whom the Cabul Government is too feeble to control. Their union under one head, whether as a confederation or in any other fashion, would make them more accessible to friendly influence than they are now; and aid or favours conferred at Cabul would reach to Herat. I hope, therefore, that we are not going to listen to any pretensions from Persia—or Russia—that Herat must be independent of Cabul and Candahar; and that if, for the sake of securing peace, we consent to the setting up of some dummy as ruler of Herat for the present, there will be nothing to bar the possibility of a union of Herat with one, or all, of the Afghan principalities whenever the chapter of accidents in Central Asia may bring it about.

'But greatly as I desire to see Herat in the same hands or under the same influence with Cabul and Candahar, I would not even for that object consent to send an army across Afghanistan to recover it from Persia. I believe it to be impossible for an English army to show itself in that country without at once alienating the common herd of the people, who do not care a straw for Herat, but who have a lively recollection of 1838 and all that followed—and provoking insult and collision. This, even if we could steer clear of a quarrel with the chiefs, would retard the consummation of that which is most essential—a friendly leaning towards us on the part of the nation at large, and along our whole frontier, in place of the inveterate distrust and hatred with which they now regard us. If this last object can be achieved—and I think the foundations are laid—it will be of much less importance who rules in Herat. If it cannot, I do not think that the setting up of a new chief there, whether he be independent or not, will avail us much. We want friendship from this side of Afghanistan first ; if afterwards we can spread it over the breadth of the country to Herat, so much the better. We shall then reap some advantage from keeping the Persians out of it; whereas to do this at the cost of exciting anew the suspicion and animosity of the people by whom the intervening four or five hundred miles of country is occupied will be a very doubtful gain. I believe that a good understanding with the Afghans will be a better bulwark against any mischief that Russia can attempt against us for many many years to

come than even a garrison of our own in Herat; and I am sure that that good understanding would be indefinitely postponed—perhaps made unattainable—by the presence of a large British force on the farther side of Afghanistan, and the measures which we should in such case have recourse to for keeping open our communications, collecting our supplies, and making the provisions which are indispensable to an army at that distance from its resources. Moreover, from Persia on this side we can extort nothing but Herat itself. She has not a vulnerable point of any importance within two months' march of her frontier, which again is nearly two months' march from our own. The whole machine of the army—which must be so large as to cripple the means of keeping up that now in the Persian Gulf—would be set to work for the recovery of Herat alone. Whereas by making the Persian Gulf our base, we can press upon her more and more severely until we have obtained satisfaction in full. We can, I fully believe, make Persia disgorge Herat by carrying on the war from the south; but I see no reason why a march upon Herat should obtain for us anything but the surrender of that place, leaving all our other claims unsatisfied. Therefore, on every account pray let us keep to one field of operations.'[1]

A month after he is found again writing anxiously on the theme.

'I don't believe that one Indian official in a hundred who talks of a campaign in Afghanistan has really given thought to the nature of the people of that country, and to the means and mode of dealing by which we can best enlist them on our side. I am sure that here, in Calcutta, this was as little thought of as if the Ojibbeways, instead of the Afghans, were in question. Help them liberally whenever they stand in need of help for honest purposes—punish their maraudding tribes on the frontier sharply, and above all quickly—encourage no family feuds, and eschew the *divide et impera* doctrine—do your kindnesses with as little show of interference as possible—and, especially, be always better than your word with them. I believe that if anything will make Afghanistan into an element of defence to us, it will be some such treatment as this. It will command their respect and self-interest, and will make them true (as true as they can be) to us, and leave them, as is their nature, treacherous to all the rest of the world. As to marching armies across to Herat, unless we are to do so every time there is a faction fight there, or unless we are to keep a force there—which would be an intelligible though a mistaken policy—I believe that we might as well pour

[1] February 25, 1857.

water upon the sand for any *good* effect that it would have in securing our influence in Afghanistan. The *bad* effects are much less doubtful.

'I agree in what you hint to be your opinion as to dealing with Eastern nations. I go farther, perhaps. A little brag is not amiss with Westerns, when skilfully thrown in; but with these fellows, who live upon big words and extravagant exaggerations, the smaller our talk the better—provided we never bate a grain from it. This and plain speaking without fearing to offend has been the rule of the Peshawur Conference.[1] I wish it had been followed with Persia. Such a demand as that for the dismissal of the Seide Azim, withdrawn upon resistance, will make the old Ameer think that after all the Shah is cleverer than himself, and knows better how to deal with the Feringhees.'[2]

These letters, written on his way out and immediately after his arrival in India, found Lord Granville in the midst of stormy waters, for, notwithstanding the Crimean War, the first year of his leadership in the House of Lords was not uneventful in regard to domestic questions. In the Life Peerage controversy and the Bill relating to Matrimonial Causes he was at once called upon to deal with two subjects of extreme delicacy. One of these raised an issue of great constitutional importance affecting the rights and privileges of the House of Lords itself, and the relations of that House with the Crown and with the other House of Parliament, while the other touched on many of the most cherished prejudices of both the religious and the political world.

At the close of the year 1855, in order to strengthen the House of Lords as the Highest Court of Appellate Jurisdiction, an eminent lawyer, Sir James Parke, who some years before had been appointed to a Judgeship, on the recommendation among others of Lord Lyndhurst, was created a peer with the title of Lord Wensleydale. The patent of creation, however, conferred on him a peerage for life only. The question thereupon was at once raised whether, even assuming the Crown to have had the right to confer

[1] After the Conference at Peshawur a treaty of friendship was signed between Dost Mohammed and the Government of India on March 30, 1858.

[2] March 25, 1857.

a life peerage — itself a disputed point — such a peerage carried with it the right to sit and vote in the House of Lords: in other words, whether a writ of summons to sit and vote in the Upper House could issue to a life peer. It had long been the object of the more far-seeing members of the Liberal party to find some method, short of the wholesale creation of hereditary peers contemplated at the time of the Reform Bill, to weaken the solid Tory phalanx which dominated the House of Lords, and at the same time to strengthen the highest Appellate Court. But ranged against the proposed change there were found not only the regular opponents of every change, but also a respectable body of independent opinion composed of those who dreaded the revival of a disused prerogative of the Crown, and discerned in this attempt to strengthen the Upper House the possible commencement of a gradual diminution of the comparative importance of the Lower House of Parliament.

Lord Derby quickly recognised his opportunity. The Government had got themselves into a false position. He however told the Queen and the Prince Consort that 'a way out of the fix ought to be found other than a retreat on the part of the Crown, and that this should be based on a thorough discussion in the House of Lords on the real objects of the Government, and the real wants of the House.' [1] In other words, he consented to discuss the statutory creation of life peers on condition that the present proposal was dropped, and in conversation with the Prince Consort he urged the necessity of limiting the numbers and defining the classes from whom the selection might be made. He expressed a special dread of literary and scientific life peers, though, as he does not appear to have suggested that hereditary peers should be prohibited from gaining distinction by translations from the Greek and Latin poets, it must be assumed that the difficulties which he anticipated were of the character attributed to the Prime Minister in a modern play, when he suggests that his private secretary

[1] Prince Albert to Lord Granville, February 24, 1856.

should attempt to discover some person the appearance of whose name in a Birthday Honours List would at least not excite general disapprobation. The Prince Consort also was believed to be in favour of the introduction of 'literary and scientific peers,' and as the Prince Consort was at this moment unpopular, it was easy to raise up odium against the proposal.[1]

'Jealousy, not confidence'—so argued the veteran Lord Lyndhurst—was the maxim on which the British Constitution was based: the danger of any undue exercise of its prerogatives by the Crown might at present be remote, but how long the present state of things would continue, no one could venture to foretell. A plausible case against the Wensleydale peerage could in fact be made on old Whig principles, and when Lord Granville quoted the legal adage, *Nullum tempus occurrit regi*, in defence of the revival of the prerogative of the Crown, and gave as an illustration in support of his case that the royal veto on parliamentary bills had not been exercised for a hundred and fifty years, yet that nobody would say that the prerogative of the veto did not exist, he was on dangerous ground.[2] It was true that the Crown had offered a life peerage to an eminent judge, Dr. Lushington, in 1851, but Dr. Lushington had declined it, nor could the Whig leaders deny the force of the statement that, so far as precedents were concerned, there were none beyond some dating from remote times when the Constitution in its modern development did not exist; and others a little more recent, but made in favour of ladies of dubious reputation in the days of the later Stuarts and the early Georges. But these ladies, it had to be admitted, had never claimed to sit in Parliament, even in their most adventurous moods. The matter seemed to many of the Liberal peers themselves to

[1] 'A noble friend has informed me that there was another reason which influenced many in voting in favour of Lord Lyndhurst's resolution and against the creation of life peers—the idea that the late Prince Consort entertained the plan of swamping the House of Peers with men having some smattering of science and literature.' (Speech of Lord Granville, *Hansard*, cxcv. 1663.)

[2] Lord Granville, February 7, 1856, on the motion to appoint a Committee of Privileges, *Hansard*, cxl. 280. See too *Hansard*, cxcv. 1663 (April 27, 1869).

be a question for legislation rather than the exercise of the prerogative. Lord Grey drew up a series of resolutions which he communicated to Lord Granville in order to extricate the Government. He proposed to ask the House to admit Lord Wensleydale, but to prevent the patent in his case being drawn into a precedent, and suggested that thereupon communications should take place between the two Houses for a legislative settlement of the whole question. Lord Granville, however, declined to profit by the proposed compromise, and the matter had to be fought out. Lord Glenelg then moved for a reference of the question to the judges. This Lord Granville supported, but the proposal was defeated. Lord Lyndhurst next moved that neither the letters patent, nor the letters and the writ of summons issued in pursuance of it, could entitle the grantee to sit and vote in Parliament, and Lord Grey moved his resolutions by way of amendment. Their defeat practically ended the struggle, and Lord Lyndhurst's motion was at once adopted as a substantive motion. An hereditary peerage was shortly after conferred on Lord Wensleydale.

There remained the question of some permanent means of strengthening the House of Lords as an appellate tribunal; but the measure which the Government introduced, founded on the report of a Select Committee, though it got successfully through the Lords, perished in the House of Commons, which by this time had been thrown into a state of unreasonable apprehension about the risk to them of proposals to strengthen the Upper House. Thus it was not until a later date, when the united authority of Lord Cairns and Lord Selborne prevailed, that any permanent improvement of the House of Lords as the supreme Appellate tribunal was found possible. Lord Granville never ceased to regret the decision of the House of Lords, as he told the House in 1869, when he supported a Bill brought in by Lord Russell to create a certain number of life peerages every year: a proposal which, though carried successfully through the committee stage, and supported by Lord Salisbury, as well as by the Liberal leaders, was thrown out on the third reading by one of those ugly

rushes of the rank and file of the Tory peers which in the Upper House occasionally prove stronger than even a combination of the experienced leaders on the two front benches.[1]

LORD GRANVILLE TO LORD CANNING.

January 31, 1856.

'The Queen opened Parliament in State. I carried the sword with dignity and aplomb. This evening the debates went off well in both Houses. Dizzy very mild. Roebuck a failure. Derby chaffing, but good in essentials, and rather patriotic. Clarendon good in substance, less so in delivery. I bad for three minutes, and good for two. There is the devil to pay in our House about Baron Parke's life peerage. Found Dr. Sandwith of Kars and La Marmora in Bruton Street. Both very pleasant and instructive, particularly the latter. He says that we must take care not to copy Continental armies too much. We ought to be content to organise our transports in the different countries to which we go, or else we shall have a transport corps which will be too much to be conveyed across the sea. He thinks our present system of Secretary of War and Commander-in-Chief impracticable. So do I: *et vous*? Newcastle walked home with me. He is evidently sore, and hates Mars.

'*February* 1.—The questions of peace and war are almost forgotten in our House, such is the excitement about the Life Peerages. Lord Lansdowne, Lord John, and Macaulay are the only great living authorities on our side that I know of. The latter has, however, given me a perfect letter from Lord Eldon, in which he recites all the difficulties of selecting Law Lords on account of their want of fortune. Lord Lyndhurst, supported by Derby, by St. Leonards, and Jock Campbell, is going to move that the question of the patent, which they hold to be illegal, unconstitutional, and impolitic, should be referred to a Committee of Privilege. I doubt this being perfectly satisfactory with respect to a question which involves the Queen's prerogative at least as much as the privileges of the House of Lords. I am getting extremely hot and interested in the question, and have convinced myself, which is always satisfactory, of our being entirely in the right.

'*February* 2.—I had some talk with Lord John about the Life Peerages. He is stout about it. At the Cabinet we again discussed the Life Peerages, and we are to have a Cabinet on Tuesday to consider the terms of Lord Lyndhurst's notice of motion which will be

[1] 'There is not one of us who does not deeply regret the vote come to by the House in 1856, when the case of the Wensleydale Peerage was before it.' (Speech of Lord Granville, *Hansard*, cxcv. 1662.)

given on Monday evening. We then discussed a plan of campaign, and it was settled after much debate to urge upon the Emperor the necessity of letting us send 40,000 men to Georgia. The Barony of Belper has been offered to Strutt, and similar offers are to be made to Lord Kenmare and Gibby Heathcote. Macaulay is postponed for the future, as it would seem illogical at the present moment to make him an hereditary peer. I went to dine at Frank Waldegrave's, and found that I had mistaken the day. She was gone out to dinner.

'*February* 9.—I have been unwell with gout all this week, and got into almost a foolish state of excitement about the Peerages for Life question. I worked hard at it, was very nervous, but made, I am told, the best speech I ever made. People have been very civil; the most satisfactory part of it was that Redesdale began to listen to my legal case with a broad grin, which, however, ended in a very sulky look, as I demolished Lord Lyndhurst's law. This I was able to do by extracting from Jock in sham controversies the whole of their case, and getting the answers from Willes, who is a charming fellow, and I am told the best lawyer on the Bench. Palmerston made a very good speech yesterday about America, firm but very conciliatory. I forgot to tell you what you will see by the papers, that we had a horrid beating in the Lords about the Peerage case. We mean to fight it out. We have got Grey keen on our side. Newcastle is for the thing, *but thought the Government had not set about it in the right way*, and would not vote. The Duke of Wellington and Clanricarde voted against us. I cannot say how much I miss you in and out of the House. Ben begins to hold his own in the Cabinet, and cracks his jokes. I carried my Education Bill in the Cabinet; Labouchere, Charles Wood, and Harrowby objecting to-day.

'Vernon Smith, who, like Wood, talks of "my army," will probably à la Pacifico send you orders to take Karak; Ellenborough laments over your having such a scrape to begin with as Oude.

'*February* 10, 1856.—I am vexed at having missed so many days in the last letter which was sent off, particularly as I was in such a hurry yesterday to save the post that I could not recapitulate anything that had passed. This Life Peerage question will make rather a curious bit of constitutional history. We have settled partly by Grey's advice to go into the Committee of Privileges, and there point out the objections to every course which is proposed. It is a difficult question to handle, and the Chancellor is not equal to fighting all the other Law Lords. Our object ought to be to carry our point if possible, without its being taken up in a democratic sense by the House of Commons and the country. Lord Aberdeen voted with us the other day. I hear that the Opposition mean to fight it till the

last. On other subjects I hear that they mean to concentrate all their energies on the Kars case.[1] I dined at Frank Waldegrave's last night; a long dinner. Elgin most affectionate towards the Government and me, bored me after dinner with all the power that command of language, ability, and information can wield. I chaperoned Tissy Pitt to Lady Pam's. Her drum appeared to differ in no respect from those which you were wont to frequent. I was much complimented about my oration. This morning I went to hear Brookfield, who, as Ben says with some truth, quoted Milton and Shakespeare and described the devil as a perfect gentleman. In the evening in Bruton Street, Shelburne read to us a charming letter from an old lady, describing the character of her late page, whom she called Willy, because Alexander was rather long for a page. I forgot to tell you that young Seward raves about Forester. Humpy told me yesterday that he was in despair, that I had declined buying a 500 guinea hack. "I owe you much, my Lord, and this is the only way we have to show our gratitude, by submitting what we have, which is really good."

'*Wrotham, February* 12, 1856.—After acting as godfather, I trained up to town for the Committee of Privileges, where we had an amusing but irregular conversation, which lasted about two hours. Leave was given to Lord Lyndhurst to appoint a learned assistant to search precedents for him. It is known that there are none which he has not yet produced. They are to be printed and circulated, and we meet again on Monday next.

'*London, February* 13, 1856.—I came up for a Cabinet to-day, where a very satisfactory memorandum drawn up by order of the Emperor was read. It meets our views. Pam and the Emperor give in to some wild views of aggrandisement on the part of Piedmont, which will never be realised. The Emperor proposes that the Duke of Modena should be sent to govern the Principalities, that the Duchess of Parma should take Modena, and that Parma should be given to the Sardinians. Sardinia, on the other hand, wishes for a slice of the Legations. Letters from Paris describe the whole of the population as violently anti-English. The Major believes that if there is any hitch in the negotiations, Englishmen will get insulted in the streets. Brunnow, who has stolen a march, and arrived first at Paris, was cheered all the way to his house. Cowley is here. I had a man dinner to-day, principally foolish peers, moderately dull. Lady Granville had a large party afterwards, which lasted until

[1] A full reply will be found in the *Life of Viscount Stratford de Redcliffe*, by Mr. Stanley Lane Poole, to the charges that were made against him in regard to the surrender of Kars (vol. ii. ch. xxxi.).

two o'clock. Lushington, who dined with me, told us some curious stories respecting his practice. When the Duke of Kingston died, the real property went to Lord Manvers, and the personal property, amounting to 400,000*l.*, was claimed by some one whose name I did not catch. The Crown objected that the claimant's grandfather's marriage certificate was dated one year after the birth of his son. The claimant gave up everything as lost. Lushington told him not to despair, that this birth was previous to the Marriage Act, and a private marriage, or a public acknowledgment of the husband and wife, would do. But how can such a thing be proved? Try to find out the name of the clergyman of the place where your grandfather resided, ascertain whether he has any representatives. The name was discovered, and a grandniece found. She was asked whether she had any papers of her great-uncle. "Yes," said she, "there are some in the garret, but they are gradually diminishing, as we use them to light the fires." The remaining papers were examined, and a note was found from the grandfather to the clergyman, bearing a date previous to the public marriage, asking him to dine with himself and *his wife*. Upon this the Crown consented to a compromise, and gave up nine-tenths of the property.

'The Peelites are violent against us on Life Peerages, and even Lord Aberdeen is going to vote against us on the next occasion.

'*February* 14.—I breakfasted at Macaulay's this morning—Lady and Miss Trevelyan, Milmans, Lord John, Stanhope, and David Dundas. Macaulay in great force, and apparent health. He talked of Cobbett abusing the Quakers, as if he was entirely guiltless of such an act.[1] He quoted him at the end of the financial difficulties of 1825, asking "whether after all these events the Quakers and Unitarians will now venture to deny that there is a God." He told a story of Johnson which is not in Boswell. Mrs. Thrale said that Goldsmith would be his best biographer. Johnson answered, "Yes, perhaps in a literary point of view, but I have personally two objections. He is perfectly unscrupulous about truth, and he is peculiarly malignant against me." He quoted a Tory member praising the Habeas Corpus Act at the moment the Government was proposing to suspend it: the Whigs cheered; the orator, nothing daunted, continued: "Yes, sir, I am alluding to this inestimable measure, the suspension of which enables the Government to suppress insurrections and revolutions." He talked of Pitt bursting into laughter when he read a private letter from Lord Wellesley in which he described the nations of India passing before him. "Only

[1] The allusion is to the controversy as to William Penn's conduct in the reign of James II. See Macaulay, *History of England* (ed. 1872), i. 506; ii. 223.

fancy," said Pitt, "the little man with the nations passing before him." I here adroitly grazed their ears with the anecdote about Ellenborough and the pencil. Macaulay then maintained that no good Governor-General, with common sense and judgment of men, ought to be overworked. It was a mistake for him to attempt to do that which others if well selected would do better for him—*avis aux lecteurs*. Stanhope quoted George the Third telling Lord Lansdowne that he had never known a Scotchman abuse a Scotchman without cause, or an Irishman praise an Irishman without a cause. Lord John quoted the Duke of Clarence saying it was quite a mistake to suppose that the King liked the Scotch. He hated them more than he hated the English and the Irish. I walked home with Lord John. He was half querulous and half friendly. I moved the first reading of my Education Bill. It is the first Bill I have ever had for which I am the responsible person.[1] Aberdeen, G. Byngs, Elgin, F. Levesons, Greys, and Sidney Herberts dined with us; pleasant enough. I got beat at chess by Mrs. Sidney Herbert. The Ailesburys are still at Savernake. You will be sorry to hear that I had a row with *the* swell hack cabman, who gave a shilling back to Henry Byng on his promise of never calling him again. He complained of my shilling being too little. I took it back and gave him sixpence; mean, eh?

'*February* 15.—Nothing particular to tell you. In our House we had a quantity of little questions, and I had to speak on all, and made a resolution to avoid doing so another time; both for myself and the House and my colleagues a greater division of labour would be better. In the House of Commons, I hear, there was a spirited debate. Roebuck spoke and made a notion on the American question. Pam followed him, hit very hard and said that Roebuck held a brief for the enemy. The House cheered, and the man deserved the reproof, but the phrase is an awkward one in our present relations with the States. "Lucky" Villiers is Bishop of Carlisle. I certainly did not expect it twenty-one years ago. Dicky Milnes told me to-night that his father has refused the peerage.

'*February* 16.—I went with Marie to see a marble bust by Noble of dear Granville Fullerton.[2] Wonderfully good considering that the sculptor had never seen him alive. I afterwards attended a tiresome meeting at Willis's Rooms to raise a subscription for a memorial to Joe Hume. I said a few words, and complimented a workman who had spoken. I was afterwards informed that he was the leader of the

[1] The Bill creating the office of Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education. See ch. xv. pp. 420-421.

[2] The son of Mr. and Lady Georgiana Fullerton.

Chartists. We had a Cabinet in the afternoon. We discussed the way of meeting a motion of Layard's, in which he conveys censure on the Government for certain military appointments. The second report of McNeill by inference accuses Cardigan, Lucan, Airey, and Gordon of neglect. Luckily, it turns out that this report was received after the rewards and appointments had been given to them. It was agreed to follow the precedent set after the Cintra Convention, when a military tribunal was established to examine into the conduct of the officers. We then discussed the Life Peerage question, and agreed not to vote for some resolutions proposed by Grey, which would confirm the Baron in his seat, would throw much dirt upon the Government for the course which they have taken, and would enable the Crown to make life peers subject to an Address from either House on each creation. He meant to get a friend to propose calling in the judges as to the legality of what has been done, and when once the legality is established go into a committee to consider the best mode of creating them for the future. I dined at a Whig dinner at Lord R. Grosvenor's. Johnny sat next to me, and was very pleasant. He said that the landlord at Southampton told the Attorney-General that his hotel was a respectable house. "Of course it is, or I should not come here." "But you have a lady with you." "Yes, but she is my wife." "That is what I say to my wife, sir; but she asks how it is that your wife is sometimes tall, sometimes short, sometimes fat, and sometimes thin."

'*February* 18.—I called yesterday on Lyndhurst in consequence of hearing that the Whips are using conciliatory language. Old birds are not to be caught with chaff, and I got nothing out of him. We parted agreeing that we were not to mention that we had met. I had another long talk with Willes, who, however, has nearly exhausted what he has to say on the subject of Life Peerages. I hear your sister is very violent on this subject against the Government.

'To-day we had the Committee of Privileges again. Old Lyndhurst was rather out of sorts, and we had the best of it, but all to no purpose, as they have the majority when we vote, which will be on Friday. Glenelg asked Lyndhurst whether he did not mean to call in the judges. The four Law Lords jumped up one after another to object, and we do not mean to propose it, as Aberdeen, Grey, and Fitzwilliam are against it; the former is, in fact, very hostile to the Government on this question. I met the capitalists pouring out from the Treasury with long faces; they are much disappointed at George Lewis only wishing to borrow 5,000,000*l.*

'*February* 21.—I have omitted writing for two days, partly from being tired and behind my work, partly from having found no fire in

my dressing room, and the weather is intensely cold with east wind, after a perfect spring which made the shrubs in the squares bud. We had nothing of importance on Tuesday in the House. At the Cabinet in the morning a letter from Clarendon was read giving a most favourable account of the Emperor, with whom he had conversed for two hours. The French Emperor said that he had been too hasty in agreeing to the original terms, which were found to be deficient when examined by real men of business in England. He complained of the levity of the French, and of the want of statesmen in that country. Yesterday a despatch came from Clarendon giving an equally favourable account of Brunnow's talk with him. Brunnow only wished that some arrangement should be made by which we should not supply the Circassians with arms and ammunition. He did not require that there should be any forts on the eastern side of the Black Sea, and he at once conceded the non-fortification of the Aland Isles. He said that the faster the treaty could be concluded, the less humiliating it would be to Russia. I believe there are some letters come to-day in which it is said that Brunnow has been desired to change his tone, since it has been known in Russia how pacific France is. To-day, conversation in the House of Lords on the distinction of functions of the Commander-in-Chief and the War Minister, in which Mars spoke like Apollo, and was complimented by Derby and Grey. Bessborough is miserable at our having divisions in which we are beaten in the House of Lords. I believe it will often be our fate.

'*February* 22.—Only one word to tell you the result of our debate on Life Peerages. We were beat first on the reference to the judges proposed by Glenelg in a good speech of the old school, and secondly on the question itself whether the patent conferred a right to sit. I spoke on the first question, and was satisfied with what I had said, which Lord Aberdeen pretended had changed his vote. Argyll spoke remarkably well on the main question. The majority was between thirty and forty against us. Buccleuch came all the way from Edinburgh to vote against us; he goes back to-morrow.

'*February* 23.—This morning I called on Derby, to see whether any compromise would be possible. I do not think he is ill inclined, but he is afraid of his lawyers. The Cabinet acquiesced in what I proposed, viz. to try to get Derby to agree to a Bill limiting the prerogative to the creation of six peers for life, of whom three only could be created in one year: Lord Wensleydale not to attempt to take his seat until Parliament had considered this proposal. I saw the Prince Consort in the afternoon, who agrees on behalf of the Queen, and promised to talk the matter over with Derby.

'*February* 24.—I had a letter from the Prince this morning giving a satisfactory account of what had passed with Derby, whom I visited. We agreed that I was to open the question, and that he would follow, making suggestions, and asking others to do the same. At church there was an amazing number of fashionables. You will see in the papers an account of Sadleir, late the Lord of the Treasury, his suicide and his enormous forgeries. His brother was chairman of a joint-stock Tipperary bank, which has now stopped payment. Bessborough had 3,000*l.* in it, and all his tenants were depositors. . . .

'*February* 25.—By a most provoking forgetfulness on my part, I have forgotten to send this letter off to-day. It has been a busy day. A Cabinet has been summoned for to-morrow. I addressed the House in a conciliatory tone about Life Peerages, which Johnny Russell thought full of dignity. Derby, I believe, almost unintentionally ran false. He has given notice of a Committee to inquire into the Appellate Jurisdiction of the House. If we can get the Committee properly named, we may yet be saved. I went after dinner to pay the Flahaults a visit. He has hurt his arm falling down the Admiralty stairs.

'*February* 26.—Nothing very interesting in the Cabinet. There has been a great opposition to a Board of Trade Bill abolishing tolls and local town dues. Bob Lowe, who is disliked by many in the House, made a rattling speech, in which he went deeply into the abstract question of property. He showed a great want of knowledge of the House, and either disgusted many, or at all events gave them a pretence for voting as they wished, viz. against the Bill. Baines made a good speech. It was settled to-day to refer one part of the Bill to a Select Committee. To-night, when Palmerston announced this intention, Dizzy made a slashing speech against the Government for their failures in both Houses, and Labouchere answered with great spirit and amidst general applause.

'A very serious telegram has arrived from Clarendon. The Russians declare they will not give up Kars unless we give up the proposed line in Bessarabia. After much discussion, both parties agreed that no agreement is possible. Orloff has demanded an audience of the Emperor, who is very shaky upon this point.

'*February* 27.—To-day a levée, during which some little accidents occurred, such as a civil but retiring soldier bounding off Norman's stomach into the Queen's arms. We had a pleasant Cabinet dinner at Labouchere's: food exquisite. We discussed foreign affairs. I backed up Pam as to remaining firm at all events till we know that France and Austria are sure to abandon us. Clarendon is very cautious both in his despatches and private letters, and evidently

intends not to stretch his instructions upon any point without positive instructions from home, based upon no advice given by him. He gives us the facts, and leaves to us the task of drawing the inferences. I think him right, particularly in Cupid's hands. I hope to tell you the perfect truth about myself, bad and good. I therefore must say that I find I have gained ground in the House of Lords this year, and I am treated in the Cabinet as the next leader much more than I was.

'*February* 28.—The Emperor has refused to receive Orloff; and Walewski, examined by Clarendon, was very grand to Brunnow. The latter humble and apologetic, but saying that he must get fresh instructions. I bless my stars that I am not a plenipotentiary. Another conversation in the House to-night upon the Appellate Jurisdiction. After some discussion, Ben, Bessborough, and I got a tolerably good committee. If Lord Aberdeen runs straight, we shall have a majority in it. St. Leonards is furious with his party, who called "Question" the other night when he wanted to speak. This was not made better by Colville, who wrote an official complaint to Derby, stating that it was impossible to whip if St. Leonards went away after he had made his own speech and did not stay to vote. In Madame de Lieven's last letter to Charles Greville, she remarks that the four head plenipotentiaries are Counts, the four subs Barons. *Observation puérile, mais qui montre que je n'ai rien à vous dire.* The "Lodger" went to Paris; lodges at the Embassy, which makes Lord Lansdowne snort a good deal. I have a good deal of gout flying about me, and do not feel the thing.

'*March* 6.—This last observation was so true, that I had a severe attack the next day, and sent an excuse at the last moment to the Duke of Cambridge, who had invited me to dine and meet her Majesty. Her Majesty, however, would not sit down, as they were thirteen. Princess Mary was sent for, who obligingly read my part at a short notice.

'The next morning, after receiving a visit from some of my friends, I was suddenly seized by my old enemies, and I have been laid up by jaundice ever since, losing Wensleydale Committees, Cabinets, and, what I regret the most, opportunities of writing and sending letters to you. I am getting about again, and hope to be allowed to go out to-morrow. Where would my liver have been if I had been in your shoes?

'From what I hear the negotiations have gone on pretty smoothly as regards everything but the fifth point, about which the English stand virtually alone. The Russians give up Aland, but nothing else, not even Kars, without a corresponding concession on our part.

The Emperor has evidently been less firm with Orloff than he promised, and a little put out with Clarendon and Palmerston. I think Clarendon is a little sore both with Pam and with everybody at Paris. I suspect he has been a little too prominent in the discussions, I mean that he has done all the arguing part with Brunnow, the others remaining silent spectators, while Orloff had the advantage of coming in fresh at the last moment. He says that people in Paris accuse him of being unreasonable and impracticable. They say he is not such a *diable déchaîné* himself, but that he is the slave of the English press, and the representative of Pam's anti-Russian feeling. Pam, after a row in the Cabinet last Saturday, in which he seemed to remain firm, wrote a despatch instructing Clarendon to insist on everything being agreed to which was promised in answer to the Viennese ultimatum, but enabling Clarendon to make any concessions afterwards about the Bessarabian frontier which may appear necessary to get equivalent concessions over and above the surrender of Kars. I have no doubt of peace being the result, but, as I believe I have already said to you, I bless my stars that I am not a plenipo. Charles Greville writes amusing letters from Paris, very like himself. He says that as he has no society in London but the ground floor of Bruton Street with Panizzi, the Poodle, and Norman for a *bonne-bouche*, he is surprised to find himself at two balls, two parties, and a play, not to mention great dinners, in five nights. I should think he must have been in the way of Cowley and Clarendon, lodging as he does at the Embassy. Johnny Russell made a violent attack yesterday upon George Grey and the Government, and, followed only by Gladstone and Graham, walked out against the whole Liberal party on Church Rates.

'*March* 7.—Lady Sydney dropped in yesterday evening, and brought with her some Bombay papers, giving an account of your successes. I was particularly struck with the praises of you as an examiner, and I own I could not conceive your being able to question without preparation well-educated youths upon Newton's *Principia* and Butler's *Analogy*. To-day came your charming letter with a description of the feat, which still appears to me to be marvellous. I, who have never read Butler, was comforted the other day by reading in *Rogers's Table Talk*, by Dyce, a bad book, that Rogers quoted Fox as thinking Butler a bad teacher of reasoning—that anything could be proved by analogy. I do wish you and the Viscountess joy of your having made so good an impression at starting. I attach great importance to it. I pity you for your inferiority to the other Viscount when you are reviewing your armies.

I will get him to write a few hints to you on the subject, but nature has denied to you that chin and that air.[1]

'Johnny made a great speech on Education last night, but I doubt his having advanced the subject much. I missed yesterday a most amusing scene at the Wensleydale Peerage Committee. The Solicitor-General[2] was examined as to the defects of the Appellate Jurisdiction. He with his most mincing manner, and most perfect aplomb, supposed the case of two learned Lords, one of whom gave judgments without hearing the arguments, ran about the House, conversed with lay Lords, and wrote notes and letters; the other who made declamatory speeches, thumped the table, asked whether anyone would venture to say that that was law which had been just laid down by the Lord Chancellor, and who in short entirely forgot the dignity of a judge of the highest Court of Appeal. Brougham and St. Leonards were furious—tried to bully him, but were completely foiled. Derby and Lyndhurst laughing fit to kill themselves. I got out to-day, and being desired to choose a sheltered spot, clambered up Primrose Hill. The east wind has made another and I hope a wiser man of me. I am jealous of Sydney, who, I hear, fired by my example, is writing a diary to you. Pray read mine first, or he will take all the wind out of my sails, and tell me honestly what principally bores you, and what you chiefly miss in these scrawls.'

TEDDESLEY, *March* 18, 1856.

'Another long week passed without writing. How disgraceful, and no very good excuse, and the stimulus all the time of the thought of the Viscount writing daily chronicles of all that is going on in Paris, Conference, accouchements, &c. &c. The latter is an event in some degree useful to the Emperor, giving on the one hand a greater appearance of stability to his Government; on the other, discouraging Opposition parties from letting him reign quietly during his life. It is a great blow to Plonplon. The Emperor and Empress are to stand sponsors for all the children born on the 16th. One of the disadvantages of not writing every day, for one whose memory cannot carry Butler's *Analogy* in his head for twenty years, is that it is impossible to know where one left off. Did I tell you that a speech of George Grey's, and a great majority in consequence on the Police Bill, has set the Government upon their legs, the said legs being, like mine, of rather a gouty character? Pam has done very well, I hear, during this session, and he is proportionately sanguine for the future. He and Hayter are against dissolution; the Speaker, the Bear, and others recommend it. Lowe at present

[1] The allusion is to Viscount Sydney.

[2] Sir Richard Bethell.

a failure, but his intellect must triumph in the long run. In our House, Ben Stanley is improving, and made an excellent debating speech on Limited Liability the other night. Luckily we believe Derby is with us on that question, or else it is rather serious having the three best political economists in the House against us, viz. Overstone, Grey, and the Kite. I believe we are right, and, whether right or wrong, it is a very clear question to argue. Harrowby is very unpopular in the House on the opposite side, but speaks to the purpose. In the Cabinet he is tiresome, moves Ben's bile much, but is favourably looked upon by the god of love. The god of war is not yet found out as to want of capacity by the public, but his telegraphic communication to Simpson, desiring him on his assuming the chief command to take care of his nephew, has awakened the old suspicion of his being a great jobber. Clarendon seems to have done very well, and is certainly much raised in public opinion. We mean to talk as big as we can about the Peace, with speeches, firing of guns, letting off of fireworks, &c. &c.'

LONDON, *March* 20, 1856.

'Had a slight spasm in bed; sent for Meryon. It was well before he came. He desired me not to go to Windsor for the confirmation of the Princess Royal. I went, and am none the worse; my complexion beautiful. It was an interesting sight. As Pam observed, "Ah, ah! a touching ceremony; ah, ah!' The King of the Belgians the same as I remember him when I was a boy, and he used to live for weeks at the Embassy, using my father's horses, and boring my mother to death. The Princess Royal went through her part well. The Princess Alice cried violently. The Archbishop read what seemed a dull address; luckily it was inaudible. The Bishop of Oxford rolled out a short prayer with conscious superiority. Pam reminded Lord Aberdeen of their being confirmed at Cambridge, as if it was yesterday. I must go to bed, so excuse haste and bad pens, as the sheep said to the farmer when he jumped out of the fold.'

LONDON, *March* 22, *Good Friday.*

'After church I rode to Richmond. Lady John on her *chaise longue*. He in good spirits, thinks that Pam will be tolerably well received. He is pleased with his Education speech. He cannot conceive any arrangement for the Principalities which will be perfectly satisfactory. "You must either throw over the Turks, or offend the inhabitants of the Principalities." Did I tell you Merewether's[1] answer when he was asked whether the failure of his bankers, Paul,

[1] The celebrated Queen's Counsel.

Strachan & Co., had not knocked him down. "No, I only lost my balance." Go on sending me messages for Ellenborough. He likes them.'

LONDON, *March* 23.

'I had a pleasant dinner yesterday at Stafford House. Dufferin said that at the St. Patrick's dinner he paid a great compliment, which they evidently supposed was meant for Eglinton, and he was violently cheered. When he had finished it, and applied it to Carlisle, there was a dead silence. This must be accidental, as the latter's popularity is said by everyone to be great. Sandwith evidently detests our Ambassador, and believes him to be a very harmful public servant. He had never seen a man so floored as he was by the appointment of Malmesbury. He had already announced all that he meant to do in the Foreign Office.[1] Palmerston says that he unavoidably kept Stratford waiting. The latter went away, and two days later told his chief that he was nearly voting against him in the House. The other replied, "I am uncommonly glad you did not, as I am already torn to pieces by candidates for your place." We had a Cabinet to-day on the Peace. The Treaty will be a very good one, and its conclusion reflects great credit on Clarendon. He has been desired to delay signing till we have the whole thing before us, and we have a Cabinet for that purpose on Monday. I shall go to Aldenham the night of that day.'

ALDENHAM, *March* 25, 1856.

'I came here yesterday after a Cabinet, at which some of the articles of the proposed Peace were examined by the select few who were weak enough to remain in London for the purpose. Clarendon complained to the Emperor of Walewski (we think foolishly now that it is all over). The Emperor opened his eyes, and said that his minister had given him to understand that he had presided at the Conferences in a manner unsurpassed in the annals of diplomacy. Clarendon says that is true, but in the contrary sense to that in which Walewski said it. Clarendon does not blame the Russians: "they are right to get all they can. The Emperor is enchanted with his son, dying for peace, does not care sixpence for the terms, and is only anxious to do that which may be agreeable to the Emperor Alexander." We meet again on Saturday. Peace will be signed before Parliament meets. Johnny is a charming host.[2] It is rather a curious feeling coming

[1] In March 1851, when it was supposed that a Conservative Government would be formed, Sir Stratford Canning had the offer from Lord Derby of the Foreign Office; but when in 1852 a Conservative Government was actually formed, he was passed over in favour of Lord Malmesbury.

[2] Sir John Acton.

as a guest to one who has always been one to me, and to a place where for years I was master, and where many little objects of interest have ceased. What I have felt seriously is the loss of that darling boy Granville Fullerton. I have not been here since he died, and this place has reminded me more of him during different periods of his life than anything has yet done. His loss to me will be irreparable. What it is to his poor parents is too melancholy to think of. I think they are more absorbed by their sorrow than they were even at first. It is a pleasure to see Lady Granville's happiness here; I think her zest about it is not in the least diminished by her having given it up. Johnny is very affectionate to her, and nice to me.

'All your friends are more or less ill. Ben alone flourishes, and takes a decided tone in the Cabinet, shows great jealousy of Russia, and has certainly gained self-confidence: whether it is owing to his being President, and the popular member of the Board of Trade, I do not know. Why would Argyll if he gave sovereigns to Rowland Hill's children be like the setting sun? Do you give it up?—it has nothing to do with his hair—"it is because he tips the little hills with gold."'

LONDON, *April* 7.

'This long interval is owing to ill health, which you might suspect from a sentence in the opposite page. Marie took me *vi et armis* up to town, which I left the next morning to go to Bristol, where I made a long discursive speech on Education. I dined and slept at Blaize Castle, a good house in a perfectly beautiful place, belonging to a Mr. Harford. He has the most satisfactory collection of first-rate pictures I have yet seen in England. The next day I came to London. Gladstone came in the evening, was very civil, and made himself very agreeable. Before he went away my pains came back, and I have had jaundice ever since. My new doctor (Williams) says that I shall be convalescent in a week, and that with great care I shall get on till the end of the session, when Carlsbad will cure me: this is not very encouraging. During my illness many events have happened. In politics we have had peace. The terms are not known, and I think will be thought better than were expected. The Conference is still sitting discussing Italy, a general declaration as to the rights of neutrals, and against privateering, &c. &c. A Marquisate was offered to Clarendon, a Viscountcy to Cowley. They both refused, the latter on the ground of poverty. Clarendon is said to have gained golden opinions at Paris. Here his reputation is much raised by the negotiation. John Russell is evidently sore at the contrast. Many think that the Government

will now fall to pieces. Pam is of a contrary opinion, and so is Johnny. The prevalent rumour is that Argyll, George Lewis, another commoner, and Harrowby are to make way for others ; that I am to give up the Council and the Lords to J. Russell, and that I am to be offered Paris to let me down easy. The Bear told me yesterday that what the Protectionists wanted was Palmerston leading the Commons, and Derby the Lords ; that what the Whigs wanted was Palmerston in the Commons, and Johnny in the Lords. All agreed that the Opposition in the Commons is disorganised. Walpole, Pakington, and Dizzy have all and severally had passages in debate. Malmesbury refused to take Mrs. Dizzy into dinner at Lady Jersey's because the Dizzys cut him and his wife.

'Peace has been wonderfully well received in the country. Great commercial prosperity is expected. Overstone thinks that we shall see a time of frightful speculation. In public affairs, it is evident that economy will be the great move. Gladstone is on bitter terms with Palmerston. Dizzy, the Bear, and Somerset, are all throwing out lights in that direction. There are suspicions that Wilson is the real Chancellor of the Exchequer. Bob Lowe says that the present Government has a great advantage in the House of Commons over the Government of Lord Aberdeen. The latter had an able leader, but one who was careless, indifferent, and often absent in body as well as in mind, and the Home Secretary cared and knew nothing about his business.[1] The present Government has a leader who on the whole is the most popular man in the House, unwearying in his attention to the business of the House, and who never misses a division ; while the second most important person, the Home Secretary, is perfect in his own business.[2] He says the same thing of the Commons as Dicky Milnes says of the Lords, that the generality of Cabinet Ministers do not take a sufficient part in the debates. I believe that India is likely to be made a *cheval de bataille*, and your finances, the Torture question, and the double Government, are likely to excite much talk. I am glad of it for your sake. Vernon Smith seems to do his work well, but I hear that his unpopularity in the Commons is great. I am glad for you that the storm which is brewing is likely to burst soon, and it will perhaps have a tendency to put your predecessor on our side.'

LONDON, *April* 8, 1856.

'I have taken my first constitutional ride to-day, and am certainly much better. Ben says that the House of Lords is going to the dogs, that Lord Lansdowne and I do not come down, that Clarendon

[1] Lord John Russell and Lord Palmerston are referred to.

[2] Lord Palmerston and Sir George Grey are referred to.

is away, that Panmure comes and goes away immediately, that Argyll irritates Derby and his bench, and that Harrowby makes a mess. Bessborough says Ben insulted Overstone without cause the other evening. In the meantime the *Post* and *Globe* announce my appointment to Paris, and hope that my health will not prevent so desirable an arrangement.

'Did I tell you that the poor "Lodger" has been worried by a big dog, and is happily none the worse? He was sitting with Lady Melbourne. He was petting the late Lord's dog, a black Newfoundland, and taking, as he avers, no liberties either with him or his mistress, when suddenly the beast flew at him, tore his great-coat, which fortunately he had not taken off, into little bits, and bit him on the haunch and on the elbow. He was not thrown, and Lady Melbourne at last succeeded in getting Nigger out of the room. It appears that this is not the first exploit of this sable hero.

'I have been reading to Marie, the Duc de Broglie's speech on his reception at the Academy. It is clever, as only a French speech is when spoken by a gentleman and a master of that extraordinary language for conveying shades of opinion. It is as full of allusion to the present state of things as you might expect, but all carefully covered up. He describes the First Emperor's merits; his indefatigable labour, his habit of sharing the dangers of his army, that army which he himself had trained, his unmerciful treatment of adventurers, of traitors, *faiseurs d'affaires*, &c. &c. He takes advantage of his predecessor M. de St. Aulaire's History of the Fronde to explain how Mazarin, being a foreigner, in power, unscrupulous as to means, and intent only upon benefiting himself, destroyed the ablest men in the country, ruined the finances of the country, and enriched himself.'

LONDON, *April* 11, 1856.

'I do not know, supposing there was a vacancy, whom we could get to strengthen us in the House of Lords, excepting Dalhousie. Newcastle and Grey would be of course great catches in debate, but Bessborough thinks they would neither of them bring a vote. Graham in a very able speech full of clap-traps made mincemeat of Johnny and his Education resolutions. Argyll and Freddy, who heard the beginning of Johnny's reply, tell me it was painful to observe the indifference of the House in listening to him.

'*April* 25.—We get beat in both Houses every night. We have carried our point in Committee, so far as to get Wensleydale seated as a life peer. The Crown is to have the power of making four Law Lords peers for life. There is a great difficulty about a successor to poor Cowper as Lord Lieutenant of Kent. Sydney will, I think, get

it. Conyngham, with a whole set of relations in both Houses backing him up, insists upon having it, and particularly objects to Sydney. The whole Liberal party say that it is monstrous to make a Tory with no estate, and a villa near London, the head of the magistracy. I am for the Viscount. Bessborough for Lord Camden as a middle course. . . .'

LONDON, *April* 26.

' . . . I am writing in the Cabinet, where we have been hours over a most important despatch from Clarendon to Marcy on the Enlistment question. It was originally ill drawn by Hammond, it has been entirely rewritten by Pam, and I think will be an able document.

'*April* 27, 1856.—I have been much annoyed by finding that my letter of the last fortnight will not go for two weeks. We could not get through the despatch to Marcy yesterday. Palmerston proposed that we should meet at his house to-day at twelve o'clock. The Cabinet looked surprised, and Baines at last suggested that he should like to go to church. This rather astonished Cupid, who was as usual amiable, and professed that he had no objection to his colleagues going to church. I dined at Derby's ; a dull Whig dinner. He and Jem were rather fun, chaffing each other.

'When I got back I found a pleasant set in Bruton Street—Lord Wensleydale, Laboucheres, Ch. Howard, and some of the regular *habitués*. This morning after church to Pam's, where we remained four hours and a half, doctoring the despatch to Marcy on the Enlistment question. I stood up for a conciliatory end and a Special Envoy. It was unanimously agreed that something conciliatory should be put in, and it is now an excellent despatch. The majority of the Cabinet were with me about an envoy, but Palmerston strongly and Clarendon weakly objected. They were supported by the Chancellor and Ben. I believe an impression was made. I dined this evening at Bath's. Nothing could be better, more pretty and pleasanter.'

LONDON, *April* 28.

'I have had rather a busy day. I have finished a report on the Appellate Jurisdiction. I made a commonplace little speech at Willis's Rooms in favour of a memorial to those who fell in the East. I was obliged to go away immediately, but I hear Elgin was eloquent, and Newcastle. We had a Council. The Queen in great spirits, and polite ; a dull House of Lords. Ellenborough talked much about you. He says you must ride early in the morning, and live four days in the week at Barrackpore or you will be done up in a short time. Pray follow this advice.

'I hear that Palmerston's meeting this morning was satisfactory; everybody unanimous; the reverse is reported to have been the case at Derby's. Whiteside has made a very long, able, but not effective speech about Kars, very violent against Stratford Canning. Lyndhurst, who had given notice of a motion about the state of Italy, has postponed it at Clarendon's request. Clarendon was loudly cheered when he laid the Treaty on the table of the House. He stands very high now.'

LONDON, *April* 29.

'Peace was proclaimed this morning by the Heralds. It was slightly cheered at St. James's, and hissed at Temple Bar. We had another little Cabinet at Palmerston's this morning to give the last touch to the American note. My plan of a mission was knocked on the head; but Clarendon is to tell Dallas that nothing will induce her Majesty's Government to recall Crampton on the grounds stated by the American Government; but that as soon as the question is finally settled, he has been made so uncomfortable of late, and his wish is so strong to return to Europe, that he will be transferred to another post. We had a meeting at the Privy Council—G. Grey, Baines, Graham, Walpole, Pemberton Leigh, and Dr. Lushington—to consider the Oxford Statutes, which have been confirmed for certain Colleges by the Commission. There is a strong petition from the Dissenters against a provision which they deem to be contrary to the Act, as to their admission into Colleges. Harrowby is said to have got into a mess in this matter. I saw Ellenborough in the House. He says what I trust is not true, that Lady Canning has been thrown out of her carriage. He desired me to tell you that he had particularly warned you against letting her go without guards, and he trusts that you will for the future follow his advice. He has heard that your Commander-in-Chief[1] meddles with the duties of your Military Secretary, who knows much better than he does all about the Native army. He bade me tell you that the Duke of Wellington wrote to (I think) Lord Combermere to say that the Commander-in-Chief was only in Council to support the Governor. If he does not do so, he advises you to pack him off to some other quarters. His Commanders-in-Chief were sensible men, who always thought as he did on everything.

'The Evelyn Denisons and Glenelg came in the evening. The latter is to second the Address, which Ellesmere is to move in the Lords on the Peace. Longman gave a cheque for 20,000*l.* to Macaulay the other day for his last two volumes.'

[1] General Anson.

LONDON, *April* 30.

'I called on Palmerston this morning, and asked him to give a step to John Le Fevre in the Bath, and make Deportment[2] a Grand Cross of the same. I suppose you will have something in that line soon. I believe Fortescue and Pam are to have the two Garters. The Spider is to have the Grand Cross of the Bath. I presided at a Reformatory School dinner this afternoon, and went to a concert in the evening at Court. Are there many opportunities when a Governor-General can speak in India? If so, seize them for practice sake. Derby won the two thousand guineas and a 300*l.* plate yesterday, which consoles him for the beating which his party got in the House of Commons about adjourning the debate on Kars. Graham and Sidney Herbert went away; Gladstone and his tail voted with the Opposition; the Government have a majority of seventy. Gladstone's unpopularity is something beyond belief. Everybody at the concert was talking about Lady Canning's accident, but Lady Sydney reassured us. Have I told you that there is the devil to pay about the Lord-Lieutenancy of Kent? Conyngham and Sydney are ready to tear out one another's eyes.'

LONDON, *May* 1.

'It will make your mouth water to hear of our May day so cold that we cannot keep ourselves warm. We had a meeting at the Palace to-day about the site at Kensington Gore for the National Gallery. The three Chancellors of the Exchequer were of course the principal actors. I am afraid I thought Dizzy shone. Dear George Cornewall Lewis was so slow and ponderous, and Gladstone more than usually crotchety and refining. The Prince much afraid of the last. I paid the Duchess of Beaufort a visit. She had been to her first ball, which had entirely knocked her up. I also saw Lord Lansdowne laid up with lumbago, but very chatty and pleasant. We had a family dinner. Rivers and Freddys. Lady Mary Wood—very pleasant and pleasing, if those two words mean, as I believe, two different things—came in the evening. I followed her to Madame de Flahault's. Coventry House too gay and pretty. The society the refined essence of cream, with a beautiful buffet laid out. Some of the women could hardly get into the doorways. A popular preacher at Paris pointed out the other day, with respect to the present fashions, that the way into Paradise was very narrow.'

LONDON, *May* 2.

'A majority of 127 for Government last night on Kars. Graham spoke, some thought a handsome speech, others an unhandsome

[1] The allusion is probably to Lord Sydney

one. He and the Peelites voted, Sidney Herbert says, against their consciences, with Ministers. I found Pam radiant this morning notwithstanding gout. He is said to have spoken well last night. Derby cross in the House to-night. We had a little conversational skirmish, in which I had the last word. I sent Bessborough afterwards to consult him as to the length of the holidays. He said we might adjourn for six months for all he cared. The "Lodger" came back from Newmarket minus his cash to-day. Baudin, who is sent to Russia, Sneyd, Bob Grosvenor, who had just been speaking for bandsmen who are conscientious sabbatarians, Calcraft, and Dow. Morley, dropped in and were pleasant. Morleyiana. The Bishop of Exeter, finding her with sore eyes, told her it was a judgment for the mischief they had done. I was amused at an account of my mother, who does not care a rap about politics, and Lady Carlisle, who thinks of nothing else. Lady Carlisle *loquitur*: "Dear sister, are you sure that you are quite satisfied with all the conditions?" Lady Granville, who had just mastered the fact that Peace was made: "Yes, dear sister, but I have not read them." Good night. I am getting better.'

LONDON, *May* 3.

'Russia is to be offered to Wodehouse. It is doubtful whether he will accept. He has announced to Clarendon that the Foreign Office is his object in life.[1] I should think a mission abroad would further his chance, if he does not stay away too long. You would both be glad to hear how acquaintances talk about and regret you. You require no assurances about your friends. It appears to be a long time since you went. It must appear longer to you. You must stick to your ship now, excepting in one case. If you find your health suffers, do not throw away the greatest blessing in life.

'Yours, G.'

[1] Lord Wodehouse, who afterwards, as Earl of Kimberley, became Foreign Secretary in Lord Rosebery's Administration in 1894.

CHAPTER VIII

ST. PETERSBURG AND MOSCOW

1856

THE Crimean War was at an end, but the hostile feeling between Great Britain and Russia was not terminated by the Peace. The Emperor of Russia was about to be crowned; and the occasion, it was apprehended, would be used by him for advertising the friendship which he was now encouraging with his recent French adversary. The choice of the representatives of the Queen at the coronation was therefore one of unusual importance. In addition to their Ambassadors the Great Powers were each of them sending a special mission to attend the ceremony. Lord Wodehouse had been appointed Ambassador, and it was decided by Lord Palmerston and Lord Clarendon to invite Lord Granville to accept the headship of the Mission. The coronation at Moscow was to be the scene of festivities of an extraordinary character in honour of the new reign; and in Lord Granville, a member of the Cabinet and a former Secretary of Foreign Affairs, the Government considered they would find a fitting representative under circumstances not unlikely to make great demands on the possession by the representative of Great Britain of tact mingled with firmness, especially as M. de Morny had been appointed to represent France.

LORD GRANVILLE TO LORD CANNING.

ALDENHAM, *May* 13, 1856.

'Clarendon asked me to speak with him after the last Cabinet, and after many excuses for proposing such a thing, asked me whether I would go to the coronation of the Emperor of Russia as Ambassador Extraordinary. I saw no possible want of dignity, but objected to

the expense, and suggested that such a man as Ailesbury would do better. He said that Orloff had spoken to him seriously at Paris of the hostility felt in Russia; that he, Clarendon, was not popular there; that Palmerston was detested; that everything for the future would depend upon the footing on which the relations were first put by the persons now going out; that I was the person; and then Clarendon told me all that Orloff had said of me, but I own the compliments sounded more like inventions of the moment than what the Scythian was likely to have said. With regard to expense he said he should be prepared to ask Parliament for 10,000*l.*, and that the compliment would consist in the person sent being a member of the Cabinet able to express the opinion of his colleagues, and not in the extravagance of his expenditure. I promised to reflect, and let him know in a few days. I consulted Marie, who pronounced some sage aphorisms, but danced a hornpipe, and lamented that it would be necessary to buy twenty gowns and have her diamonds reset. I spoke to the Duke of Devonshire. He was delighted, very keen, recommended it, promised loans of plate and gifts of cash. We, Marie and I, worked ourselves up, made out lists of attachés, &c., and I called on Clarendon in the evening. He said that in his opinion there ought to be an extraordinary Embassy, that I was the best man for the purpose, that he would write to Palmerston at once to consult. I am inclined to like the thought of going. I shall never see Russia if I do not do so. It will be good fun making the preparations; the actual time there will be tiresome, and the recollections for the rest of one's life probably amusing. I do not think it can have much influence good or bad on one's political position.'

After a few more preliminary discussions, Lord Granville received his appointment and started for St. Petersburg.

During his Embassy, Lord Granville kept a journal in the shape of letters regularly addressed to the Duke of Devonshire, who had himself in 1826 been sent on a similar mission to St. Petersburg at the time of the coronation of the Emperor Nicholas.[1] Of these letters, copies, with some occasional omissions and additions, were sent to Lord Canning, and in the following extracts from them will be found an interesting description of the ceremonies when "all Russia went to see His anointed come to His Holy Place;" which, if the reader be so minded, he can compare with the impressions

[1] William Cavendish, sixth Duke of Devonshire.

of Dr. Creighton, Bishop of London, of another and more recent event of the same kind in 1896.[1]

LORD GRANVILLE TO LORD CANNING.

LONDON, *May* 25.

'When Clarendon wrote to the Queen, she answered evidently not liking an extraordinary mission at all, but very civil about me, and anxious about my health. The first arrangements have kept us very busy. I have got a frightfully large suite, with some women—an innovation, praised and blamed. It would be better if two were not ugly. I believe we shall be—the Staffords, the Robert Peels, the Lichfields, the George Byngs, and the Freddys; Johnny a private secretary, Lord Seymour, Lord Cavendish, Villiers Lister, Burghersh, Dalkeith, Gerald Ponsonby, and Sandwith as doctor. . . .'

ASCHAFFENBURG, *June* 23, 1856.

'I must try to remember what we have done since we left England on Monday last at 4½ o'clock P.M. All my friends were very anxious to get me off for reasons of health; some, such as the little Duke, with an unconscious wish to have more opportunities of speaking in the House. As far as health goes, they were certainly right, as I felt a different person almost before I got to Croydon. We found the Ailesburys at the station, who came to see the Clanwilliams off. We had a good passage. Our Dr. Sandwith was introduced by me to Clanwilliam. We like Sandwith. He has much tact, is agreeable, gentlemanlike, and seems sensible as a doctor. Very much for water, and against physic. He has a slight cunning Oriental twinkle in his eye which I do not quite like. We went to a dance at St. Cloud—a very pretty fête. The women ugly, their dresses superb: a few friends, but not many. The Imperial couple were civil, but did not allude to politics. I have seen a good deal of Morny. His expenditure for the Russian Embassy is enormous; the freight of his goods will amount to 5,000*l.* His horses cost 8,000*l.* His State carriage 2,000*l.* He has built a French railway carriage to take him from St. Petersburg to Moscow. His carriages are gala and very pretty. I saw three of them. The arms are as follows: Nos. 1 and 2, blank; No. 3, a star in the top corner; No. 4, a Hortensia; No. 5, an eagle. Motto: *Tace sed memento.* His talk about his instructions and his intentions was satisfactory, and nothing could be more gentlemanlike than his way of speaking about what we should do in the way of assisting each other at

[1] 'The Imperial Coronation at Moscow,' originally published in the *Cornhill Magazine*, 1896, and republished in Dr. Creighton's *Historical Essays and Reviews*, 1903.

Moscow without saying anything about it, and combining our efforts instead of *lutté'ing* against one another. Walewski, who is considered by Clarendon and Cowley as completely Russian, was sensible enough in his talk about the Peace, and the danger the alliance would have run if war had been continued, in spite of the wishes of the whole people of France. Madame Walewska was in good looks, but I am sorry to say with a slight dash of artificial pink, in which colour most of the French *élégantes* appear now to indulge. Brunnow very civil. He evidently thinks my Embassy too large.'

HOF, *June* 24, 1856.

'Marie and I travelled with aristocratic *morgue* in our own carriage. Orloff was in the train. He was very civil, and said that if in Russia I wanted advice, or a service to be rendered, he was at my orders. He praised Clarendon, and said that by previous conversations they were able to avoid disputes in the Conference. He said Clarendon seemed amused at some of the snubs which he was obliged to give to some of the plenipotentiaries. He mimicked Bourqueney, saying, "La mer noire neutralisée! (lifting up both his arms) quelle chose admirable!" It was amusing, as Cavour had imitated for us Orloff mimicking Bourqueney. He says that Cronstadt would have been a very hard nut for us to crack. He does not think we should have succeeded even in burning the fleet. In any case the loss would have been frightful. He had advised peace, because it was impossible for Russia to make any *coup*. She must have remained on the defensive. Brunnow, in London, told me, "Je scais me taire, mais pour dire ce qui n'est pas absolument vrai, voyez-vous, ça m'est parfaitement impossible." In the course of conversation, Orloff said to me as Brunnow said before him, "Moi je dis toujours la vérité, je parle des choses comme elles sont." I shall be curious to observe how many Russians in the next three months boast to me of telling the truth. Orloff had on slippers, a uniform, and an order in his bedroom, on the second floor of this little inn.'

HAMBURG, *August* 3, 1856.

'At Carlsbad I suspect I picked up about Russia as much as I shall learn in the two capitals. The Russians were there in tolerable numbers, all civil. Some who had been distant at first, asked to be presented before we came away. Some of them very *comme il faut*, others very vulgar. This appears to me to be peculiarly the case with that nation. There seems to be no *juste milieu*. They all spoke freely of the war, and are more ready to acknowledge that they were licked than we in England even believe them to have been.

'Old Pahlen was the most irritable of all on this subject. He says it has done no one good; not to the English; certainly not to the Russians; and has only been of use to one man in France, a party whom he is not, as you know, fond of. He says that in England they considered him as merely speaking like a Russian parrot when he said that the Emperor Nicholas did not wish for war, and that he was considered in Russia almost a treacherous Anglomane when he declared that our Government did not wish it. He had been right in both cases, and yet by extraordinary bad management the war had come. He thinks it will take a whole generation to efface the recollection of it. He attributes the hatred of us, and comparative forgiveness of the French, not so much to the destruction in the Baltic, not so much to our press and our public speaking, as to our having been old friends, and their having always thought of the French as enemies. He does not believe in any great changes in Russia. The Emperor has good intentions, but there have always been good intentions at the beginning of each reign. He has one great advantage over his father. Alexander during his life told Nicholas nothing. Nicholas, since his son has been of age, told him everything, and the latter, being of a very amiable disposition, heard everything that others did not dare tell his father. He is supposed not to have military tastes, but he issued new regulations about uniforms almost before his father was buried; and he and Constantine appeared in new hussar jackets a day or two afterwards, which were supposed to be foreign, instead of a new dress which he had been in such a hurry to exhibit himself in. He dismissed Klein Michel and another (two great robbers); and when his mother remonstrated on the ground of their having been his father's friends, he made a good answer, which he had probably previously prepared. He said, "I am not a great man like my father. He could use such men as his tools, I am not strong enough." He lays much stress on the absolute poverty of Russia in able men. He thinks Gortchakoff clever, but indiscreet, vain, and not successful in things which he undertakes. (This is confirmed by everybody.) Tolstoi, a great friend of the Emperor, by whom he is called Milord Tolstoi, has no ability. Kisseleff, who is named Ambassador to Paris, is clever, but has never been a diplomate, and is seventy years old. Meyendorf, really clever, is done up. Chreptowitch is nobody.[1] Orloff himself clever, but perfectly ignorant. He says that Gortchakoff laments to every one this dearth of men to appoint. So Bloomfield told me. Pahlen says that in England it does not signify if we want a man, we can always pick up an intelligent man

[1] The new Russian Ambassador to Great Britain.

in some rank of life or other, who will soon master the specialities of his business. In Russia those who are not diplomatists by profession are profoundly ignorant of all that relates to it.

'The Russians begin to abuse Nicholas openly. I heard the Empress Mother called a *vieille imbécile*. One young man told me that the last reign was a military one, that the next would be an aristocratic one. I do not believe this is more likely than that it will be a commercial one, which is all moonshine.

'We are almost on the point of quarrelling with Russia. Some of the things were loosely done at the Paris Congress. The French don't care a d——n, and we have sent more ships into the Black Sea to bully. This is not pleasant for the mission.

'We go to Kiel this evening, sleep on board, and sail from Kiel to-morrow morning.'

'ST. JEAN D'ACRE,' *August* 7, 1856.

'We arrived at Berlin on Friday, weary and hot. Bloomfield received us civilly at the station, and gave us information about Russia and Prussia, and a lot of despatches to read, the wading through which prevented my seeing almost anything of Berlin. They are not pleasant. The Island of Serpents was forgotten at Paris. The Russians will not now give it up, and have actually sent soldiers there. The Turks have by our advice sent soldiers also. Lyons is now ordered to support these soldiers, and the Russians are to be informed that we will not evacuate the Black Sea, till they have given up Kars, about which there is some unaccountable delay, and till some dispute is settled about the boundary in Bessarabia. In some of these points the Russians are behaving very ill, in others our rights appear to me to be doubtful. It is clear that there was too much hurry at Paris. In the meanwhile the Austrians stand by us, while the French will not take a step in this matter.

'I am instructed to use very strong language, which of course will not be regarded as long as France stands utterly aloof. Gortchakoff complains bitterly of the difference of the two nations. Wodehouse holds his own with them all, including the Emperor. When the latter said something about the *dégâts* in the Baltic, Wodehouse disputed it with Hango, and silenced him.[1] I do not know how far all this will make our Embassy unpleasant.'

PETERSBURG, *August* 8, 1856.

'We were all up early to see the entrance into Cronstadt. After the ordinary salutes, one of the Emperor's yachts came alongside.

[1] On June 5, 1855, an English boat's crew with a flag of truce was massacred at Hango in the Baltic.

The captain's orders from the Grand Duke Constantine were to put himself entirely at our disposal.

'We were all delighted with the entrance into the Neva, the honours of which were done to us by the Russian captain, by Sir J. Acton on the strength of his recent visit, and by a young Micheli, a midshipman on board the St. Jean d'Acre, who had been brought up at St. Petersburg, and talked Russian like a native.

'We were met at the landing place by François with a quantity of hack carriages to which some smart Russian horses were harnessed, those which had been jobbed for me, and behind the carriages were a mass of London footmen. My carriages and English horses had been prematurely sent to Moscow.

'The pavement is detestable; English carriage horses get their legs knocked about, while the Russian horses are good-looking, very fast, and their harness extremely pretty. I regretted having been over-persuaded by Baron Brunnow, whose advice on all other subjects was friendly and judicious.

'The appearance of St. Petersburg, deserted and in bad weather, disappointed me much. We drove up to Demuth's. The apartments were excellent; they were quite new. The stairs were carpeted, and shrubs and flowers were in profusion. The dinner was equally good, but the prices of the latter disgraceful. We paid 60*l.* a day for the food of ourselves and attachés, independent of enormous sums for the servants, and of wine &c. &c. for ourselves.

'*August* 9.—Peel went this morning to announce my arrival to Prince Gortchakoff, who received me at once. Peel took Ashley with him; the latter was immediately recognised by Prince Gortchakoff from his likeness to his father. I had a very long and serious conversation with Prince Gortchakoff on the present relations of the two countries. He was in a state of great irritation with her Majesty's Government at the summons of an English officer to withdraw the Russians from the Isle of Serpents and at the re-entry into the Black Sea of four of our men-of-war. He is an immense talker, vain and indiscreet, with a great deal of cleverness. I felt very shy when I was ushered through a long suite of rooms by a gentleman in uniform, in order to discuss the affairs of Europe with the head of the far-famed Russian diplomacy. I found it much less formidable than I expected. He is just pert enough to waken up one's spirit of debate, and is so incautious that he lays himself open to anyone who has more lymph in his temperament. He repeats himself much, flies about from one subject to another, and always sings a chorus about his own frankness, his sincerity, and his being a *paysan*. On the whole he was very civil to me personally, and we parted good friends.

'Wodehouse is very amiable and civil. They live in the Islands, but he has taken a good house in the Place Michel belonging to old Lazareff. He is clever, well-informed, and a good fellow.'

PETERSBURG, *August* 10.

'The Staffords are arrived; they and Cavendish all well. I have telegraphed to their respective Dukes. Julian Fane, who has been very useful to us, came to me with an *air de circonstance*. He took me into another room, and put a letter surrounded with an acre of black into my hand. He watched my face with the deepest sympathy, and thought I was a little mad when I gave three cheers. It was a note from Ailesbury announcing their arrival with Prince Woronzow.'

PETERSBURG, *August* 12.

'I am much struck with the great *disparate* of things in this town. The beauty of some, the wretchedness of others; the want of trees, of women in the streets, and of *bourgeoisie*. I cannot see the melancholy of the peasants so graphically described by Custine and others. They look dirty and poor, but gay and good-humoured when sober, and the most affectionate race I ever beheld when drunk. The regimen applied by the police in the latter case is peculiar. They first throw cold water upon them according to the approved European fashion, and then rub their ears violently, which seems to restore them to consciousness, as they immediately walk away.

'Among some sights which we saw was the Kotchubey Palace, to which young Nesselrode took us. It is a very fine house indeed, and appears gay and comfortable. We paid the Princess a visit in the evening. She is not in the least the beautiful, voluptuous, die-away, refined creature I expected to see. She has not the slightest resemblance to her sister Madame Rudolphe Apponyi. She has good eyes, is short, beautifully dressed, but very prim, with the air of a governess. Her society is almost exclusively foreign. She is disliked by the Russians, who say she is dangerous and *mauvaise langue*. She is supposed to be rather in love with Valentin Esterhazy, which gives a tinge of opposition to her salon, as the Austrians are perfectly detested here.

'The delight of the Russians is intense, as Prince Paul, after taking infinite pains to arrive first, and having asked for his audience, found that he had forgotten his credentials, which will make him follow both Morny and me. The Austrians are very sensitive and frightened at the incivility of the Russians, and are surprised to find that we do not much care. This makes them disposed to cling to us.'

PETERSBURG, *August* 13.

'Saw sights and dined with Wodehouse, a good dinner in rather a pretty cottage, with the same profusion of flowers as is generally observable here. We went on with the Wodehouses to a dance at the Princesse Kotchubey. Not many people. The house in the Islands charming and peculiar. We were struck with the want of beauty. Morny, who has recovered from the illness which most foreigners go through on their arrival, was there. He is very cordial and amiable with me; he and Lady G. do not like each other very much, and he is immensely "ambassadorial" in his manner, like all Frenchmen when they get a place. He remarked that there were thirty women at the ball, and thirty teeth, pretty equally divided.'

PETERSBURG, *August* 14.

'This day was appointed by the Emperor to receive the Embassy at Peterhof. Prince Gortchakoff recommended me to go by land; but as Count Borch, the Master of the Ceremonies, told me it was optional, I thought it more dignified to go in our own tender, the *Princess Alice*, rather than in a quantity of hack carriages. I gave a passage to a large number of the Austrian Embassy, who were to be presented at the same time. We were all on board soon after ten o'clock, the time appointed, when it was announced that Lady Emily Peel's maid had forgotten her mistress's gown. In an ungallant humour I settled that it was better that poor Lady Emily should not be presented on that day, than that the whole Embassy should run the same risk. I, however, sent my chasseur, a *laquais de place*, dressed up in green and silver, to go ashore with the maid, and catch us if possible by land.

'Corporal Mack (photographer) accompanied us, and we began soon to wish to have our pictures taken. Infinite pains were taken with the grouping, and a burning sun upon our faces, when Mack announced that it was no use unless the engine was stopped. Count Wielkorski, a charming Russian, Grand Maître to the Grande Duchesse Marie, who had given us most useful advice at Carlsbad, suggested that we were running the time very near. On the other hand the Hungarians wished much to perpetuate themselves on board the ship. It was settled that we should steam on, all grouped, till the moment when the engine would naturally be stopped. When we had done so we found that the *St. Jean d'Acre* had sent her barge to the wrong pier. We were obliged to go by driblets in our small boats. We found Count Borch waiting to receive us with his hat off, and a whole host of chamberlains. He had been much puzzled and irritated by seeing us arrive too late, drop anchor, and then give no signs of leaving the ship. When we explained that we

had selected that moment for sitting for our pictures, the explanation did not soothe him.

'We got into a quantity of rather hackney-coach-like royal carriages and drove to the Palais Anglais, some of us to other houses at a considerable distance. In each case the portmanteau went to a different spot from master or mistress.

'Breakfast was served. Lady G. and I were the only ones ready for the departure, and in despair we started at a foot's pace in smarter but still hackney-coach-like royal carriages, which reminded me of the late Lord Ailesbury's State coach, which always stood in the stand opposite to Devonshire House. At that awful moment up galloped a post-carriage with an enormous trunk, an exhausted lady's maid and the *laquais de place* in silver and green. Odd as it may seem, the four ladies and sixteen gentlemen were all in time. The women were beautifully dressed, and looked as fresh as if nothing had happened to them. Lord Anglesey would have said to the fifteen Attachés when marshalled in a row, "Egad, I'd enlist ye all." Peel in an Ambassador's uniform; I suggested that we could not be two Kings of Brentford, and he promised never to wear it again.

'Everything now looked very royal. I was ushered by myself into the Emperor's closet. I presented my letters of credence, and offered the usual complimentary assurances. The Emperor replied with many civil phrases about the Queen. He asked after the Duke of Devonshire, and alluded to his friendship with the late Emperor. He said that the Emperor Nicholas had never forgotten the kindness which he had received in England. He then expressed a wish that the relations of the two countries should be on the most friendly footing. He feared that was not the case at the present moment; there were clouds which ought not to exist; there was a distrust of himself which he did not deserve. He had acted with perfect good faith, and intended to act in the same manner. He had thought it right to conclude a peace which had caused much irritation in Russia. No such feeling, however, had been or would be allowed by him to influence his future conduct. He assured me most earnestly that his orders since the signature of peace had been to fulfil the conditions of the Treaty of Paris, and he would give me his word of honour in the most solemn manner that all the conditions of peace should be most honestly fulfilled by him. He had perfect confidence in the good faith of her Majesty's Government; he demanded a like return. He would not submit to *chicane* or to be treated habitually with mistrust. He would behave to others in exactly the same spirit as that in which they behaved to him. He spoke these last sentences with animation, and in a peremptory tone

which was not repeated. The rest of the conversation was carried on, on his part, in a very courteous and gentle manner. Several times, on giving me assurances of his own good faith, he repeated the assurance on behalf of his late father.

'I answered that I hoped I might speak to his Majesty in the same tone of frankness without being deemed wanting in respect. I had received no written instructions excepting those of a complimentary character which I had just delivered. Before leaving England in June I had had conversations with the Queen, with Lord Clarendon, and Lord Palmerston. At that time full confidence was felt that on both sides the Treaty of Paris would be fully and immediately carried out. We all considered that the settlement of the Eastern question, a point on which England was peculiarly sensitive, would facilitate Great Britain and Russia continuing on friendly terms; that it was the desire of the British Government by the mission of Lord Wodehouse, by my Embassy, and by a very rapid evacuation of the East, to soothe any irritation which might naturally exist. Since my departure from England, I had received no formal instructions, but by my private letters and by despatches to others I had learnt that new facts were continually being brought to the knowledge of her Majesty's Government, which had increased their dissatisfaction till the present moment, when I could not conceal from his Majesty that it had reached its climax. During several months there was not even a Chargé d'Affaires in London who could give an assurance or even explanation on these points. During the last two years there had been much irritation against Russia in England. Before I came away there had been considerable reaction in public opinion, chiefly caused by the conduct of the Emperor, his supposed views, and the expectations entertained of his personal character. It was believed that when he had once decided to restore peace to Europe, his Imperial Majesty had shown no little views in negotiation. His plenipotentiaries had shown tact and ability in getting the best terms they could, and it was clear they had not been instructed to throw unreasonable impediments in the way of a rapid conclusion of negotiations. The Emperor's character had appeared in a favourable light in other respects.

'I stated that I should deeply lament that there should be another change in the contrary direction, owing to a delay in settling the few points that remained for discussion. I added that Lord Clarendon had spoken to me in the following terms: "There has been irritation in England in consequence of this war: there has probably been irritation also in Russia. Take care to be treated with the respect

due to her Majesty's representative, but do not mind a little coldness, or be sensitive about small matters."

'I had found since the day of my arrival nothing but the greatest civility, which had been continued by his Imperial Majesty up to that moment. His Imperial Majesty would forgive me if I said that although this reception was gratifying to me personally, I should have infinitely preferred to see those causes removed which created a difficulty between the two countries.

'His Imperial Majesty repeated some of his assurances as to his intentions, inquired again about the Queen and the Princess Royal, questioned me about Balmoral and Osborne, asked after persons whom he had known in England, spoke of our voyage and other ordinary subjects of conversation.

'I then presented all the members of the Embassy to him. He was most civil to the military men, asking them whether they had served in this country (Russia), also to Dr. Sandwith and to Lord Cavendish, asking the latter much about the Duke of Devonshire and giving him kind messages for him. Of the others he appeared to be most civil to Lord Stafford.

'I was then presented to the Empress. Plain, but tall and dignified, very stately at first, afterwards with a kind expression. Her conversation commonplace, very *comme il faut* and *convenable* in manner, without giving the idea of being *très grande dame.* She alluded to the success of the Duke of Devonshire's Embassy.

'Before presenting my gentlemen I ran round to beg them to insert a "Madame" into their replies if they could not manage a "Majesté." Three were ultimately successful with a "Madame." She asked Lincoln whether he had ever been in Russia. "Oh no." And then whether he had ever been on the Continent. He answered "Oh yes," with a laugh that clearly meant "That is quite another thing."

'Lady Granville says that all the ladies went through their presentation very well. The Emperor and the Grande Duchesse Marie were peeping at them through an opening in the door. The principal people with whom we made acquaintance were Princess Soltikoff, Count Schouvaloff, Prince Michel Kotchubey, and M. Hitrovo. I renewed acquaintance with M. Tolstoi at the Palais Anglais. He introduced me to his wife, with beauty airs and considerable wealth; to his son, dressed like a Russian peasant; and to a pert vulgar English nurse, who assured me in a whisper that Russia was not England.

'All the persons we saw here spoke about the Duke of Devonshire.

'At the Palais Anglais, Mack was again in requisition, as Prince

Esterhazy wished to be represented in his costume. The day was dull; immobility was preached. As soon as the signal to be quiet was given, after a group had been most artistically arranged, with the Imperial carriages as background, Prince Paul with much gesticulation inquired whether it would be long before movement would be allowed. Everyone shook with laughter, and the result was perfectly un-make-out-able.

'We then drove in *lignes* about the garden. The wheeler in our *ligne* kicked over the pole, and would have been there now if it had not been for Colonel Maude, assisted by some English and Hungarians. Then it was explained to us that all the Emperor's horses and all the Emperor's men, not to mention his carriages, were gone to Moscow.

'Some of the buildings in the garden very beautiful. What I liked best was "Palermo," a beautiful Italian villa lately built by the Emperor Nicholas.

'We were hastened back to dinner, which was good and quickly served. I took away the bill of fare as a memento of the small quantity of dishes it is necessary to order. Dimitri Nesselrode sat on one side of me; he is ridiculous but most obliging. He told me that in London he lived exclusively in the *société des Miss*, *société charmante*. We took him, some other Russian officials, the Austrians together with Colonel Colt, his wife and sister-in-law—the latter a very lively Yankee young lady—on board the *Princess Alice* to return. When on board, Lieutenant Ward, a most intelligent young officer, came to me and said that the pilot refused to take the ship in so late, that no ship of the size of the *Princess Alice* had ever entered Petersburg after sunset. He said he was sure there was no danger, that he could himself take her in, but that it was against Admiralty orders, and that it could not be done unless I would take the responsibility. I questioned him again as to the risk, consulted that experienced tar Lord Stafford, and gave the order to go in, which was brilliantly executed.

'During the time we have been at Petersburg we have seen many sights (*vide* Murray). The one which almost interested me the most was a fire. Nothing could be prettier than the fire engines galloping up with very pretty horses harnessed in threes; bay, grey, brown, black or piebald, according to the quarter of the town from which the engines came. No lives were lost. There was much swearing and scolding, but the language sounded soft through it all. I was delighted also with the new arrangement of pictures in the Hermitage. There is a new room in this palace hardly finished, which is one of the most beautiful I ever saw, half Italian, half Moorish, with a quan-

tity of columns, the whole white and gold arranged in a peculiar way. On one side it looks upon a garden raised up to it, on the other upon the most beautiful view of the Neva which I have seen.'

The Coronation itself was to be at Moscow, and thither accordingly the Court and the Embassies removed in the middle of August.

'*August* 18.—We started by the ordinary train for Moscow. We had two enormous carriages, more like houses or beds, and made ourselves very comfortable. The country was less ugly than I expected. At every station there were magnificent rooms and excellent refreshments to be had. Each is surrounded by very smart wooden villages, which recalled a little the old story of Potemkin and the Empress Catherine.

'The railway is ruined by a contract with an American company, entered into by Klein Michel, a favourite minister of the Emperor Nicholas, now in semi-disgrace. He is the most unpopular man in Russia. When a magnificent crucifix was presented to Prince Menchikoff, he hung it up between two prints of Klein Michel and General Bibikoff, as he said our Saviour was crucified between the two robbers.

'Klein Michel was reproached by the Emperor Nicholas with the delay in the opening of the railway. His Imperial Majesty insisted upon its being open on a fixed day. Klein Michel was at his wits' end, when some Americans offered to provide him with all he wanted at a certain rate of remuneration. He was too glad to agree to anything, and the result is that the traffic is enormous, the gross profits great, the Government immense losers, and the Americans are at this busy moment pocketing 700*l.* net profit a day. This contract lasts three years longer.

'We slept well, and arrived at Moscow at 9 A.M., August $\frac{7}{19}$, 1856. Our excitement was great. We found our own carriages waiting for us, one with English horses and an English coachman worth his weight in gold. If you had pricked his cheek, a gallon of porter would have rushed out at once.

'The town as we drove through it surpassed our expectations, and put St. Petersburg in the shade. Like Venice, the previous descriptions did not diminish the feeling of surprise at the original and grandiose character of the town. The great drawback to our arrival was the pavement. At first we thought it better than that of St. Petersburg, but soon we found to our cost, and to the destruction of the carriages, that this was only owing to the double springs of our English carriage.

'We at last reached the Pretchislinka, passed a very pretty small house surnamed "The General's," where the Staffords, the Peels, and the smoking members of the Embassy were to lodge, and we reached, after passing another pretty small house taken by Esterhazy, the Graziani House, which formerly belonged to a Potemkin and then to a Yermoloff. It is a large ugly-looking house without any court in front. Inside it is excellent, beautifully furnished, with a quantity of large reception rooms. We congratulated Johnny warmly on the result of his labours. The vases which I had bought from Minton were scattered about, and added very much to the effect: all our little comforts have been well arranged by Holden, and will still gain from a finishing stroke of Lady G.

'I rode with Maude in the afternoon and tried a new chestnut horse sent out from England. He is a very big handsome young chestnut, but only half broke, and I suspect is restive. We had already taken a drive under the auspices of Johnny Acton over the bridges, under the Holy Gate, and along the incomparable terrace of the Kremlin. Young Schwarzenberg and Nicholas Esterhazy, who had preceded the Embassy, dined with us.'

Moscow, *August* 25.

'My conversations have begun again with Gortchakoff, who has been very ill. The Russians pretend that he and Wodehouse talk each other into a fever; but if it is so, Wodehouse looks all the better for it, while the Prince is obliged to take to his bed.

'*August* 26.—To-day the Prince of Nassau dined with us. A charming young prince, with whom I have pleasant Radical conversation when no one is listening. He agrees with me about persons and things here. He is a great admirer both of England and of the United States. He believes Constantine would learn a great deal if he would travel for two years in those two countries. He thinks him capable of digesting the information which he might thus receive.

'The Opera is moderate in a most beautiful house, hardly finished. The French Play is tolerably good as to actors. The pit, not quite full, with nothing but people in uniform, is colder than St. James's, and not to be compared to a Paris audience.

'*August* 27.—We rode to the camp—made acquaintance with some of the officers of the Guard. They were civil, and showed us the interior of a tent, the Emperor's Company of Grenadiers, about six feet four inches high; with a tambour-major, well made, and only wanting a quarter of an inch of seven feet. They told us that in the evening there was to be a rehearsal of the great parade. We went home, dined, Wodehouse, Ker and his pretty wife, Currie, and Russell, and rode back in time for the parade. The men looked magnificent, and

the artillery horses seemed good. Lady Stafford was in a phaeton, Lady Emily Peel on horseback.

'*August* 28.—I paid Princesse Kotchubey and Madame Seybach an evening visit. The latter is very friendly, a little ridiculous, but clever and agreeable. I am sorry to miss her father, Count Nesselrode.

'I forgot to record the success with which Lady Stafford rides my little Tommy, and Lady Ailesbury Woronzow. We rode and drove a large party to-day to Astankin; the villa which the Emperor retires to after the public entry. He arrived very late this evening, after keeping everybody waiting at Petroffski for three hours. He was supposed not to be so civil to the troops as his father was on similar occasions.

'*August* 29.—We drove in State to Princesse Kotchubey's, who invited the Corps Diplomatique to see the sight from her house. We went in four coaches and the fly. The first four-in-hand with English horses, the coachman divine. A peasant was seen to gaze on him and his wig, cross himself and say a prayer. Whether he thought him an angel or a devil we do not know. The Court coiffeur, who is a Sardinian, confided to some of his countrymen of the Sardinian Embassy that the Emperor, as soon as he heard that my coachman had a wig, ordered his seventy or eighty coachmen to have wigs too. The order was executed, and it was only at the last moment remembered that the addition of the wigs would make the heads too big for the hats. The difficulty was, however, got over, whether by making the heads smaller or the hats larger, my Sardinian friend did not know.

'The entry was the most magnificent pageant I ever saw, although at my urgent request Peel gave up adding to the general effect by an appearance on horseback in the Staffordshire Yeomanry uniform. The order was admirable; the procession rolled on like water. I will not compete with "Our Special Correspondents," whom all the London newspapers seem to have sent, in a description of the details. The reception was enthusiastic. The Emperor looked well. The Empress Mother did the bowing better than the reigning one.

'As soon as it was over, we sat down two hundred to an excellent dinner well served; the whole thing very handsome. The mistress of the house, by whom I sat, is evidently *une maîtresse femme*.

'We went home for a few minutes to take off our uniforms, and came back again for a very pretty well-lighted gay ball.

'*August* 30.—Went to a parade on the terrace of the Kremlin—hot—and the officers, English and French, thought it childish playing at soldiers. The Emperor did not take much notice of any of us; more of Morny than of me. General Prince Gortchakoff and others

very courteous. In the afternoon "Sparrow Hill" with its beautiful view, and some wise reflections on the feelings of Napoleon and his soldiers when he saw it for the first time.

'Foreign and Russian dinner. Bruce, Valentin Esterhazy, the Simon Woronzoffs, Seybachs, and B. Potocki. Opera as usual, and Kotchubey.

'*August* 31.—We were appointed to be at the Grand Duke Constantine's at half past one in uniform. Some of us went to church with the determination to leave it before the sermon. The service being over earlier than usual, and a new preacher getting into the pulpit, I resolved to wait. It was all about the Divine right of kings, and the late Emperor's virtues. It was a torrent of words, and at last the clock showed the necessity of a departure, and we slipped away as quietly as we could. I heard in the afternoon that it was supposed that I had gone away in order to mark my indignation at the principles contained in the sermon, so I wrote a civil note to Mr. ——, the Jewish convert who had preached, to excuse myself for having left church before the end of his sermon, having a summons to the Palace.

'The Grande Duchesse Constantine is beautiful, not very popular, very easy to get on with, a great talker, but I should think not clever. Her husband is evidently the cleverest of the family. Natural and pleasing in his manner, very rapid and close in his questions, and talking English very well.

'Two coachfuls of Attachés lost their way and did not turn up till all was over.

'*September* 2.—Yesterday there was a great parade. Lady Emily Peel was angry with me for dissuading her from riding at this parade, which all the Russians told me was impossible, as indeed it proved to be. Dear Lady Stafford had a slight fancy for appearing like Catherine the Great in a hussar uniform, but most good-humouredly gave it up. Lady G. would not hear of going at all, and Margaret and Lady Stafford went in the barouche with postillions, which looked neat and good. I went to the Petroffski Palace in my yeomanry uniform. The Emperor asked Tolstoi who that young man was.

'As soon as we rode out of the gate, we saw a large grey horse rear bolt upright, throw himself clear over Lord Ailesbury and his horse, and knock Colonel Maude's hand, the latter being beyond Lord Ailesbury. The horse then made a plunge at the Emperor, but his rider pulled him up, sat him beautifully, and has thrown additional lustre on the name of Cavendish by his courage and horsemanship.

'The parade was a most magnificent sight, very cold and very dusty.

Orloff and Count Kisseleff explained everything to me with great good nature.

'Woronzow, the horse not the Prince, carried me beautifully.

'In the evening Lady G. and I had our Ambassadorial reception, which had been postponed from Petersburg to Moscow for our and everybody's convenience. As we were both to receive, we decided upon an innovation, and issued cards for the evening instead of the morning, and to make a rout of it. We invited people at ten o'clock. Leon Potocki complained of its being too late.

'Quand on se respecte un peu on ne peut pas venir à l'heure où l'on est invité, et 10½ c'est déjà tard.

'As he dines often *en famille* with the Woronzows, he owns that the Bruces, who are unpunctuality itself, respect themselves rather too much. 350 people came, and we got through it pretty well. The house looked handsome, and a picture of the Queen, painted in ten days by Dick Ker, one of Wodehouse's Attachés, looked tolerably well.

'This morning we were received by the Empress Mother. She spoke at great length to Lady G. and myself, and said something civil to every member of the Embassy. She sat for the greater part of the time on the arm of an arm-chair, which gave her the appearance of standing. I thought her like Princess Lieven. Her face a hundred years old, her figure surprisingly young. She talked a great deal of the Duke of Devonshire, and asked all sorts of details about him.

'All the Imperial Family are very civil to the officers and to Sandwith.

'We thought we had exhausted the society for our second reception by the quantity which came yesterday. I went to the Opera, and got back just in time to receive 850 more friends. It was a brilliant drum. The two chamberlains sent to help us were Prince Michel Galitzine, an old acquaintance, and Prince Dolgorouki. They neither of them know the Moscow society. It is evident that the *mot d'ordre* to be civil to us has been given, but other circumstances have added to it. Our numbers, the aristocratic names of our Attachés, the beauty of some of our women, have made a splash. Half the Corps Diplomatique here were Attachés at Paris when my father was Ambassador there. Lady G. is a host in herself. She is in great health and spirits, keeps English and foreign in good order. She holds her own with all, and chaffs and orders about the Russian grandees as if they were so many young admirers. She is with all this very civil, and her popularity great. She receives every evening when she has no official duties. Foreigners and English seem to like dropping in.

'Too many of our young men are shy, which the Russians take for pride, but they look very gentlemanlike, although some of them are too partial to a combination of coloured flannel shirts, false collars, and cheap jewellery, and I think the expedition will do many of them much good. It has given several of them a wish to learn French, which they have hitherto neglected.

'*September* 3.—Our dinner list for to-day is a large one. Prince and Princesse (Olga) Dolgorouki, General Prince Gortchakoff, M. and Madame Tolstoi (he is Under-Secretary of Foreign Affairs, is much liked by and sees much of the Emperor; I used to know him well in London and Paris; he has been very civil), Nesselrode (Dimitri), Count Kisseleff (named Ambassador to Paris, beginning his diplomatic career at seventy-two). He is clever and very pleasing. He is considered very Liberal in Russia. He is a reformer on the Serf question, and he tells me that many here are glad to see him off on that account. When he came back from the Principalities, the Emperor Nicholas asked him what was his most difficult task there. He answered:—

'"The question of the Serfs."

'"So it is mine here," replied the Emperor; "tell me all you think about it."

'Ten days afterwards Kisseleff was put at the head of the Domains of the Crown, and supported by the Emperor Nicholas in all his reforms. He doubts whether his work will be now carried on with the same zeal.

'It was curious that in all his conversation he never seemed to take into view the politico-economical side of the question.

'The other guests were Comte Adlerberg (the father), Princesse Soltikoff, dame d'honneur, General Pahlen (not much changed and still very pleasing, talked of my mother with great affection), Count Borch, (the gentleman-like pleasing Master of the Ceremonies), Princesse Kotchubey, Comte Schouvaloff (Grand Maréchal), Prince Serge Galitzine—eighty-four years old (old Nesselrode's only companion in the first class of the Tchin), Gortchakoff the Minister, Prince Dolgorouki (late Minister of War, who was told by Menchikoff in a quarrel about the want of powder in the Crimea: "You never invented it, you never smelt it, and you certainly never sent it into the Crimea"), Baron Lieven, Comte and Comtesse Zakrewski (the Governor of Moscow), not speaking a word of any language but Russian. She is the mother of the Dame aux Perles, the wife of my friend young Nesselrode, Count Bray, Valentin Esterhazy, Baudin, Wodehouse, Prince and Princesse Michel Galitzine (she very pleasing), and Wielkorski. The dining room looked handsome, the Duke's plate magnificent and much admired.

'We went to the Grande Duchesse Hélène in the evening. This constant putting on uniforms, and trains for the ladies, is very tiresome. She received us with great civility, made me sit down, and launched at once into political economy, where she immediately got out of her depth. She is evidently very clever and well-informed, but I would not quite take my oath that she was not a tiresome old lady after all. She went round the circle of Attachés. Freddy was supposed to have distinguished himself greatly by his presence of mind when she got deep into politics with him. She complimented Ashley on his father's philanthropy, asked him whether he was associated with him in his good works. He boldly answered "Oui," but when she requested him to specify, he was obliged to succumb.

'*September* 4.—We began again with the Grande Duchesse de Saxe-Weimar this morning. She is said to be very distinguished, but is quite deaf and as good as dumb. She adopted a new and improved method with the Attachés; she did not say a word to them when they were being presented, but made a little speech to them collectively at the end of the reception.

'We were presented to the Grande Duchess Marie. She looks very handsome, grown fat and rather like the pictures of Catherine II. She immediately began about the Duke of Devonshire and Chatsworth, and then (rather a bathos) inquired after Norman Macdonald. I thought her clever and pleasing. I had not seen her in England. In the evening we had our first ball, very pretty and gay, some of the rooms a little dark, but it went off well. We danced in the dining room, which being white and very high, with a parquet, is well adapted for the purpose and lighted admirably.

'*September* 6.—To-day we had another large Russian dinner.

'*Sunday, September* 7.—The great day for which we are all here. The weather magnificent. The Corps Diplomatique met at Morny's and formed a procession. Had excellent places in the Church of the Assumption. The music divine. The magnificent ceremony kept up its interest to the last, parts of it really touching. Morny wept a little. He was radiant in the St. André which he had received that morning. I received a note expressing a hope that I would accept such a souvenir as the regulations of my Government would allow. Prince Esterhazy, having got the St. André, had a decoration in diamonds sent him. The Order of St. Alexandre was offered to the Prince de Ligne. He declined on the ground that with his name and a Knight of the Toison d'Or, he could not accept a secondary order. A small order was sent to the Sardinian Ambassador, who accepted it as a souvenir.

'Two thousand decorations, besides medals, have been dis-

tributed, and everybody is said to be dissatisfied. Woronzow is made a Field Marshal. He was woke by a servant in the morning telling him the Czarewitch was waiting to see him. He sent his excuse, pleading illness and being in bed, but in walked the Imperial boy, and said he was sorry to force his way into the Prince's bedroom, but he had positive orders from his father to deliver the bâton which he held in his hand. Orloff is made a Prince, Monsieur de Ribeaupierre a Count, and my friend Wielkorski raised to the second class. The Corps Diplomatique missed the sight of the Emperor coming out of the church, and his enthusiastic reception by the people. Our compensation was seeing Mr. Murphy, the Irish correspondent of the *Daily News*, emerging from behind the altar with the priests. He had been secreted there by them for a consideration.

'We next saw the Emperor and the two Empresses in the old Banqueting Hall. I never saw three people so completely knocked up. We had some English at dinner, and Lady G. and I drove the Ailesburys about in the barouche to see the illuminations. They were beautiful. I never saw anything so fine as the Kremlin illuminated. We were rather successful in our own little way at Graziani's. Dalkeith proposes bringing to England our different coloured lamps as patterns.

'*September* 9.—I have now got a long story to tell. I have purposely avoided all details of the Diplomatic communications I have had with Gortchakoff, as they would be tiresome, but the following story may be of interest, as throwing some light upon the character of the young Emperor. There is great irritation felt here at the high tone taken by the English Government, by the measures which they have adopted in the Black Sea, and their policy at Naples and at Athens. Although the French are associated with us in the last two questions, their obsequiousness has been great as to everything connected with the conditions of the Peace, and the Russians have spared no attentions to detach them from the English alliance. Yesterday was the day appointed for the Corps Diplomatique to present their felicitations to the Emperor. They did so in a body. The Emperor spoke at much length, and apparently with much civility, to Count Morny. On my approaching the Emperor his Imperial Majesty made some courteous remarks to me in his usual manner about the events of the preceding day. He then desired me to inform the Queen that he retained a very grateful recollection of the kindness with which her Majesty had formerly received him. His ardent desire was that the relations of the two countries should be placed on their former footing ; that was not the case at present,

and facts proved that it was not the wish of her Majesty's present advisers that they should be so.

'His Imperial Majesty said these last words in a sharp military tone, and bowed to me in a way to intimate that the conversation was closed. I, however, replied that I would not fail to report faithfully to her Majesty the message with which he had honoured me, that I was sure her Majesty would be sensible of the recollection which his Imperial Majesty retained of his visit to England. I then added that it was not the case that her Majesty's Government had any other desire than that the relations of the two countries should be on a friendly footing. I laid a strong emphasis on the word *desire*. His Imperial Majesty replied in rather a less peremptory tone:—"This is not proved by facts;" and then bowed to the Austrian Ambassador, who followed me.

'The Belgian and Sardinian Ambassadors, who are next in precedence to Prince Esterhazy, informed me afterwards that the latter had thanked the Emperor for the decoration in diamonds which he had received. The Emperor replied:—

'"I am glad to do anything agreeable to Prince Esterhazy personally, but inform the Emperor of Austria that I have had enough of words, I want deeds. I want deeds, not words. ("Il me faut des faits, non des paroles," thrice repeated.) Your Emperor is aware of this, but perhaps the solemnity of the time that I have chosen to say it will make more impression upon him."

'Prince Esterhazy is stated to have continued in a loud voice to offer his congratulations during the time his Imperial Majesty was giving these messages.

'I have not heard of anything worth remarking in the subsequent conversation of the Emperor, who was civil to Lord Wodehouse among others.

'This was an occasion on which some discretion was required in order to obey Clarendon's instructions to take care that I was treated with the respect due to her Majesty's representative, and at the same time not to be over-sensitive as to trifles.

'The time and place, and the language held to a representative of another Power, our ally, made me think I ought to have some explanation.

'I determined to have it that evening from the Emperor at a ball given in the old Banqueting Hall in the Kremlin, called Palata. This, however, was impossible. The Emperor never ceased till the end of the ball walking the dance called the Polonaise, with the Empress, the Princesses, and other ladies, among whom Lady G. was the first, and to whom His Imperial Majesty showed the greatest civility.

'I was treated with the same courtesy by the Empress and the Princesses of the Imperial Family, which gave me an opportunity of expressing my sense of what had passed, without exaggerating a little affair into a great one, unless indeed the Russian Government wished to do so, in which case I was prepared to act.

'I therefore wrote this morning to Prince Gortchakoff a note asking him at what hour *he had made an appointment with me*, and saying that when I approached his Imperial Majesty the day before, his Imperial Majesty had addressed me in a tone for which I was not prepared: his Majesty having chosen the time when I had been summoned to offer the congratulations of my Sovereign on the late solemn and happy event, to speak to me in this manner, had raised a doubt in my mind whether it was not his Imperial Majesty's intention to convey to me that he considered my position as the head of a complimentary mission to be a false one at this moment; that I had resolved, if I could do so with respect, to avail myself of the permission to speak with perfect frankness which had been given to me at my first presentation, and to ask the Emperor at the ball to explain to me his meaning. If such an occasion did not present itself, I meant to have brought the subject before Prince Gortchakoff this morning. The marked civility, however, with which I and my family had been treated at the ball, made me happy to feel that it was not necessary for me as her Majesty's representative to entertain these feelings. I went on to say that I had, therefore, nothing to say to him, but would be ready to attend his summons if he wished to speak to me.

'His note in reply was most civil, apologising for not coming to see me as he had promised an audience to the Sardinian Ambassador, and giving me the choice of hours to call on him, but expressing a strong wish to see me.

'On my going to the Foreign Office, he came into the outer room to receive me, and immediately dismissed Count Kisseleff, who was reading papers with him. He told me that my note had only made him more anxious to see me, that it appeared that a doubt had crossed my mind as to my being personally agreeable to the Emperor, that the Emperor happened to have talked with him of me in the morning, and of the conversation which his Imperial Majesty had had with me on the preceding day, and that he, Prince Gortchakoff was happy to inform me that I was not only personally agreeable, but most agreeable to his Imperial Majesty.

'I immediately interrupted Prince Gortchakoff by saying that I could not allow the slightest distinction between myself as an individual and the British Ambassador representing my Sovereign at this ceremony.

'The Prince assured me that there was not the slightest wish or intention to separate Lord Granville from the British Ambassador. He then stated the substance of what the Emperor had said to me as related to him by his Imperial Majesty. It was not quite exact, as he represented the Emperor as only expressing a wish that the English Government should not entertain a feeling different from his own. I therefore repeated the conversation precisely as it had passed. Prince Gortchakoff said it was true that the Emperor felt annoyance at the line of conduct which her Majesty's Government had adopted towards Russia, but he had no intention of being anything but courteous towards me. The Emperor, he said, is frank and straightforward, and apt to say what he thinks. It was impos sible to avoid discussing political matters with one who held the position which I did in the Government of my country.

'I begged to assure Prince Gortchakoff that I considered it as a mark of confidence that the Emperor should say to me exactly what he felt on matters pending between the two Governments, but that it was the mode of doing so which had suggested doubts, which were now fortunately removed.

'As the Prince had alluded to the character of the Emperor, I would say that his Imperial Majesty's manner appeared to me to be not only that of a distinguished person, but very agreeable and attractive, which made the assumption of a dry short manner more remarkable; that such a tone was probably not unusual in a military country like Russia, but I had not been accustomed to it in England, or in other countries where I had sometimes resided; that the moment chosen was when the whole Corps Diplomatique was present, and when I had been summoned to present the congratulations of my Sovereign on a very solemn occasion; that the colleagues who followed me happened to be deaf, but that those who followed him had quick ears, and it was buzzed about that the Emperor had given a good dressing to (*avait bien tancé*) the Austrian Ambassador; that I could not have submitted to such a supposition about myself.

'The Prince interrupted me by beginning to say what the Emperor had said to Prince Esterhazy. I begged him not to give himself the trouble, as it did not regard me at all. I had never imagined that I was personally disagreeable to the Emperor, as I had full confidence in his sincerity, and his Imperial Majesty had been kind enough to say at my presentation that my appointment on this occasion was agreeable to him, and I felt sure that my subsequent conduct could not have justly given offence. What I had thought possible was this: England had had grave complaints to make of the conduct of

the Russian Government. The Emperor now imagined that he was aggrieved by England. In that case he might think that an Embassy of a complimentary character was out of place here. I should only be the fifth wheel to the carriage, and in no case could I bear to be the butt for uncivil remarks. It was therefore with great pleasure that I had interpreted the courtesy and kindness with which I had been treated the night before, as intended to remove any such feeling, and begged to thank him for his assurances that nothing uncourteous had been intended towards me as representative of the Queen.

'Prince Gortchakoff, who tried to interrupt me several times, acknowledged that the moment had been ill chosen for any such remarks, expressed his regret that they should have been made, and repeated his positive assurance that while the Russian Government thought they had reason to complain of the recent conduct of her Majesty's Government, no incivility had been intended towards me. I expressed my full satisfaction, and after some very friendly conversation on other subjects, we parted on very good terms.

'I believe that what has taken place will be useful, and will secure my position for the time that I remain here.

'I am placed in some difficulty as a member of the Government on a complimentary Embassy, at the moment when that Government is adopting strong measures and using irritating language to the Court at which I am accredited. I should play an undignified part if I was to submit to insults ; and, on the other hand, if my Embassy ended in a sudden departure, the termination would be ridiculous, and the future relations of the two countries embittered.

'The Emperor has many qualities which his father had not, but he is conscious that he is supposed not to have the same force of character, and he injudiciously attempts by rough and sudden sorties, in imitation of his father's manner, to obtain credit for a character which fortunately for himself and his country he is known not to possess.

'At the ball last night I danced with almost all the members of the Imperial family. The only one I thought really pleasant was the Grande Duchesse Marie ; so easy, so *grande dame*, so clever, so insolent, so civil.

'*September* 9.—This was the Jour de Fête de l'Empereur, and the Diplomatic Body were again assembled to pay their court to their Majesties.

'Prince Esterhazy was ill, but I experienced the benefit of the remonstrance which I had made.

'The Emperor and Empress were most flattering and civil to me.

I told Morny, Esterhazy, Prince de Ligne, and General Broglie what had passed, but to the regular Corps Diplomatique I merely gave a general answer to their questions.

'Paul Esterhazy said I was quite right, that he meant to have said the same sort of thing, but had been unfortunately prevented going out by a cold in his head, but would do so when he next saw the Foreign Minister.

'*Wednesday, September* 10.—I am almost ashamed of writing the following anecdote. It is so trivial, but it is curious as showing the extraordinary manner in which some of the principal courtiers adapt their behaviour to what they conceive to be the wishes of the Emperor.

'M. de Ribeaupierre dined with us on the Saturday. He was uncommonly civil to me. On Monday evening, in the hearing of a friend of mine, he boasted to a great personage that he had been close to the Emperor during his reception of the Diplomatic Body, that he had heard every word uttered by the Emperor, that the *à propos* of his addresses to everyone was wonderful, that after all he was but a mortal man, and yet it seemed almost like inspiration.

'On Tuesday morning M. de Ribeaupierre preceded the Emperor into the room where we all were assembled. He rushed into Morny's arms, and did not happen to see me. The Emperor then made me the civil speeches which I have mentioned above. I should have thought nothing more about it if M. de Ribeaupierre had not this morning, before I had finished breakfast, called to inquire how I was, and told the Groom of the Chambers that he did so because, not having seen me the day before, he was afraid I might not be quite well.

'*September* 11.—The gala spectacle was magnificent in the New Theatre. The opera and ballet dull, and the heat great.

'Foreign and Russian dinner, amongst whom Count Nicholas d'Adlerberg, brother of the favourite. He was lately Governor of the Crimea. He gave me a curious account of the horrors of Simpheropol, where he had 16,000 sick and wounded, and only hospital room for 600. He also told me that his goods are there now, that some months ago he had sent a confidential agent to bring them away, and he expected to get them at Moscow. He had that day received a letter in which he was informed that it was impossible to get carts or waggons to convey them.

'Talking of hospitals, Dolgorouki, the late Minister of War, tells an amusing story. It was agreed between him and another minister to exchange the military hospital in some place for the civil one. The plans were examined, the arrangement made, and the papers

signed. When Dolgorouki's aide-de-camp went to take possession of the civil hospital, so minutely described in the Home Office, it could not be found. The fact was reported to Dolgorouki, who merely said he would postpone the arrangement for a year. By that time the civil hospital was built, furnished, and handed over to the military authorities.

'Diplomatic and foreign dinner.

'*September* 12.—Lady G. gave her second ball, which was successful, several of the defects of the first having been corrected. The Grand Dukes Nicholas and Michel came and danced all night. I was desired not to pay them too much attention. They danced right and left; they are very pleasing, particularly the Grand Duke Michel, who is said also to be very clever. They are coming to England as soon as things get a little more settled.

'*September* 13.—This morning the Emperor called by himself in his droshky and asked for Lady G. and for me. The Emperor was not recognised by our porter, a Russian, who, when he was asked, "Don't you know who I am?" got so frightened that he lost his head.

'Diplomatic and Russian very creamy dinner, among whom Todleben the hero (charming, looks clever, and is so natural and modest), the Nuncio Don Flavio Chigi, whom I remember a very few years ago in the Noble Guard making love to English young ladies, a great Anglomane, putting all his pride in being allowed to ride an English horse by the side of Lord Chesterfield.

'*September* 14.—*Bal paré* at the Kremlin, one of the prettiest and most curious sights we have had. The whole of the enormous palace lighted up. Everybody in the national dress, many thousands of the common people admitted, and the Emperor leading Polonaises through the crowd.

'The Empress spoke for some time to one of the Moujiks, who at last said:—

"My mother, who are you?"

'She answered:—"The Empress," upon which he crossed himself and knelt down.

'I had another very pleasant Polonaise with the Grande Duchesse Marie. I sat at supper next the Princesse de Ligne. We were much amused with the way in which the Turkish Ambassador made his neighbour, Madame de Boutourline, die of laughter. He is a complete cosmopolitan. He has a capital house here; he has the best appointed carriages next to mine and Morny's, and whenever he is in want of anything he is not shy as to the means of procuring it. He dined with us to-day with seven Frenchmen, two Belgians, and

some English. His uniform arrived after dinner. He begged for a room in which he could put it on. He borrowed all Morny's huissiers in their French costume, and when his English carriage broke down, like all of ours, he sent to Count Borch to replace it.

'He drinks wine like a fish, but does not think that is the particular thing for which he will lose Paradise. He talks French like a Frenchman. He laughs at the Russians, and says confidentially, "Voyez-vous, ce sont des barbares."

'*September* 15.—Some manœuvres were announced late last night for to-day. Colonel Maude and I were the only ones ready. We got on our horses outside the gate, thinking that they were to take place close by, but we had a hard seven miles gallop, passing several large bodies of troops before we got to the Emperor's Stafi. He was late, so we were just in time. He was very gracious to me, and very sorry that I had no cloak with me, in which regret I shared. He took us off at a fast pace through a village on the top of a hill, over some broken ground, and a bridge hastily laid by the Engineers over the river, and then the manœuvres began. They were very pretty, and the troops kept moving on a regular plan. The skirmishing of the Cossacks interested us much. The hardihood of their horses arises, as was explained to me by a Russian general, very much from the same causes as the endurance of a savage. The treatment is so rough, that all who are not made of iron disappear.

'After having got wet two or three times, some of us got hungry, and led by Simon Woronzow, André Schouvaloff, and a very pleasing young Paskiéwitch, we ran away from the battle to seek for food. We met a gentleman on a little Cossack horse who offered to give us some peasant fare if we would go with him. Paskiéwitch kept shouting to him "M. le Comte" on every possible occasion, and on being asked why he treated his friend with so much ceremony, said:—

'"Because I am sure Lord Granville must think he is an ostler, and not the Grand Veneur which he is."

'He, Comte Fersen, the Grand Veneur, took us to a peasant's house where he has two rooms which he has made most comfortable, and gave us the best breakfast I ever ate. Excellent bread and butter, fresh eggs, tea, some excellent country cheese, and brandy for those who liked it. We escaped a violent storm under his hospitable roof, and returned to the review with a magnificent sun. Cavendish appeared on the big grey horse which he has made perfectly quiet with troops.

'Some English dined in the evening. I went after to Princesse Marie Woronzow. She had sent for the gipsies, whom I had not

before heard. I could not admire their looks, but I thought their singing good. A pretty Mme. de Maltzoff was there, who is a friend of the Grande Duchesse Marie. She and the Princesse smoked.

'I went from there to Morny's. His house was opened for the first time. A small ball of which Madame de Seybach did the honours. The society was well chosen, but the room dreadfully hot, and the music bad. I danced a good deal.

'*September* 16.—I went to a reception at the Turkish Ambassador. On our way back, we peeped at the magnificent Riding School, the largest room without columns in the world. It was arranged very prettily for a dinner to the officers of the army given by the merchants of Moscow. Great offence was given by the Governor, Count Zakrewski, ordering the deputation of the givers of the feast out of the room, desiring them to remain behind the door while the dinner was eaten.

'In the evening we had a ball at Prince Serge Galitzine's ; the crowd and heat were intolerable. The lighting good as usual. I sat at supper by the Grande Duchesse Marie. She was very agreeable. In the middle of the repast she said to me :—

'"Do you know, my Lord, my tongue itches to say impertinent things to you ?"

'"I should like them above all things," I answered, "if I am not obliged to report them."

'"I only wish I was Prince Gortchakoff."

'"So do I, because I have permission to see him whenever I like."

'"You would not wish to see me. How I should give it you if I was him !"

'*September* 17.—We went by appointment, led by a young chamberlain—a connection of Mrs. Henry Baring, and who would make his fortune as a mute at a funeral—to the Foundling Hospital. We were met there by another Prince Galitzine, who did the honours.

'It is a magnificent establishment, but the medical director owned to me that the late Emperor was much alarmed by the rapid increase of the numbers applying for admission, and the increased distances from which the mothers came.

'In talking of different things, I happened to mention Madame de Staël. This very intelligent and apparently highly educated doctor had never heard of her.

'We finished the day with the Donskoi Convent, where we were received by a charming old archbishop, who insisted upon doing the honours of the convent to us. He is eighty-four, and almost

stone blind, and as he generally went to the left when he meant to go to the right, it was rather a long operation.

'Lady G. and I dined with the Wladimir Bariatinskis. One of the best dinners I ever saw, with several excellent Russian dishes. It turned out to be old Nesselrode's cook, who is famous. The Prince of Hesse, nephew of the Duchess of Cambridge, dined there. The mistress of the house came to me before dinner and said that she had not asked him, but that he had proposed himself, and asked whether I, as an Ambassador, ought not to go before him.

'I said I really did not know, but that I hoped in any case she would treat me as a friend. I afterwards heard that she had put the same question to the Prince in the first place, and that he had answered that he ought to go in first, which he has no real right to do. My answer was thought sublime.

'We rushed home, Lady G. and I, for our third ball, which turned out to be the prettiest and gayest I ever saw. We had puzzled our heads how to increase the light of the ballroom, which was already brilliant. We managed forty more candles on the cornice of the two large doors, and then Lady G. suggested tying together some brass semicircles which had been brought from England. These were suspended by wire, which was not seen at night, and produced the effect of self-hanging circles of light. The Grand Duke Constantine and his wife came; they danced incessantly. She said she had never danced so much in her life, nor enjoyed herself so much. The Grand Duke said to me: "If you want to know, sir, how I like your ball, look at my face;" and to do his Imperial Highness justice, the pores of it were most wholesomely open.

'Morny and his Embassy could not be persuaded to dance the Mazurka, although Ward had found them all at Cerito's taking lessons in that dance from a music master.

'At one moment the ballroom was too crowded. We let Stafford's piper in upon them, and he then marched round the rooms to the great delight of the Grand Duke Constantine and Grande Duchesse Marie, who had old Scotch associations connected with that vile instrument; and to the astonishment and excitement of the rest of the society, it answered the purpose admirably. People got scattered over all the house, and the dancing was most animated till the end.

'*September* 18.—We went to a private *chasse* arranged for us by the Grand Veneur. The English ladies rode. I drove them four-in-hand in the barouche to the rendezvous. The country some distance beyond Petroffski was pleasant for riding, and the costumes of the barbarians, who had brought the hawks and eagles some thousand miles under the guidance of a Cossack, were picturesque. The

Russian greyhounds were beautiful. The *chasse* itself very poor sport. We again breakfasted with the Grand Veneur, who had prepared a most brilliant breakfast, which we did not think so good as the peasant fare which he had given to us the first day.

'Lady Emily Peel's horse was amiss; she therefore rode Marlborough, who, however, was a little too much for her, and she changed for a charger belonging to Prince Bariatinski. Princesse Marie Woronzoff followed in an open britzka with her lovely niece, the Princess Troubetskoi.

'We dined in the evening at the Emperor's, in the great hall of St. George.

'A magnificent dinner to 500 persons. The repast itself was good and admirably served. The plate on the table English; on the sideboard the gold platters on which had been presented the bread and salt offered to the Emperor by deputations from the different Governments of Russia. Their value was stated to amount to five million roubles.

'I went to the Opera as usual when I do not go to the French Play, and afterwards to a little music at Morny's. A very small party, to which very few of our Embassy were invited.

'I went afterwards to the Princesse de Ligne's, a little tea and a little dance. As there were only six ladies, some of whom were to say the least middle-aged, and the music was made by the secretary of the Legation, it was not very animated, but it lasted late.

'*September* 20.—This was the day of the great national fête, and the first great failure. It poured, and the people fell upon the food before the Emperor arrived. The signal was given to begin, merely as a rehearsal. The people naturally took it in earnest, and demolished not only the food and the drink, but also the tables, as is their wont on these occasions. Others say that the food prepared was of the worst possible description, and that the signal was prematurely given in order to prevent the Emperor perceiving what wretched stuff it was. Be that as it may, it was a complete failure. We returned home very wet and cold, notwithstanding an excellent luncheon which was given to us at the Petroffski Palace. Four Romans and a little Russian chamberlain dined with us.

'*September* 21.—I had an audience of the Emperor in order to invite him to our ball. His Imperial Majesty received me in his writing room. He shook hands with me and desired me to sit down. His manner was singularly pleasing. He said it would give him great pleasure to come to our ball, and indeed to give any mark of his sense of how agreeable Lady Granville and I were to the Imperial family, and how sensible he was of the hospitality and

civility we had shown to his countrymen since our arrival at Moscow.

'His Majesty then assured me that he had not intended to show me any discourtesy at the time of the felicitations, but that his anxiety on the subject of the relations of the two countries had induced him to speak to me. The Emperor then spoke of the existing differences with much dignity and moderation, but declined doing anything about them but refer them to the Conference at Paris and submit himself to the decision of that body. His Imperial Majesty during the conversation shook hands with me several times, and parted very graciously with me, notwithstanding my having spoken to him with great frankness.

'I dined with the Sardinian Ambassador, a good dinner in a good house, and as pleasant as a large man dinner can be. We afterwards had a magnificent ball at the Kremlin.

'*September 22.*—Maude and I were again the only ones ready for the beginning of some great manœuvres which were chiefly of cavalry. It was very amusing galloping about and getting out of the way of the charges. At a quarter before twelve o'clock we rode off to the Petroffski Palace, where we found Lady Stafford, Lady Emily Peel, Lady Ailesbury, and two Princesses Bariatinski.

'Betsy Bariatinski, encouraged by the example of the English-women, appeared in a riding habit and rode well. Olympe Bariatinski in a calèche tried to follow, but soon gave it up.

'Several Russians accompanied us, and were much amused at suddenly seeing a gentleman in a diplomatic uniform and a cocked hat, riding by himself, followed by two grooms in white State liveries. This turned out to be Morny, who was very shy and reluctant to come on with us.

'We kept at a respectful distance from the Emperor and his Staff, but royalty after royalty deserted him, and he soon sent a civil message to the ladies to ride with him. Soon after this a calèche with four horses abreast, followed by a very shabby ditto, was seen galloping across the plain. It was a surprise of the Empress, who was in the first with a frightful *demoiselle d'honneur*, whose name none of the Staff knew, but supposed to be a Moscow lady, and followed by an aide-de-camp who had had great difficulty in finding a carriage.

'Luncheon boxes were produced, and their contents discussed without any ceremony. Lady Ailesbury, who has been to none of the fêtes, was presented to the Emperor and the Empress.

'After dinner and the French Play, we went to a ball given by the nobility of Moscow to the Emperor at the club. The room

a very fine one, the heat and crowd great, the lighting and supper excellent.

'*September* 23.—We had received a civil message from the Emperor, saying that he did not invite us because there was nothing worth seeing, but that it would give him great pleasure if we would join a *chasse* he was to have at a château not far from the Touia road begun by the Empress Catherine in a pretty situation, but left unfinished. The Peels went there in their own carriage. I drove four in hand Lady Ailesbury, Princesse Bariatinski, Nesselrode, Freddy, and a good-looking young Wittgenstein on the box. Lady Stafford with Margaret in the fly, the rest of the men in the break. It was Margaret's first appearance on horseback; she has a pretty seat, and excepting laming her horse, which belonged to Morny, losing her saddle and running over a man, who, as Maude observed, was only a Moujik, got capitally through the day. The sport was much the same as that which we had seen rehearsed. We had luncheon in an old farmhouse. We got home in time to dine with Prince Esterhazy. He had kindly asked the whole Embassy for the day of our great ball. His house is small but very pretty, the dinner good, and the whole thing looking very *grand seigneur*.

'I think I have omitted mentioning a dinner which we had at Morny's, with pleasant society, an ornamented dinner, excellent bonbons and bad wine. Our wine, *par parenthèse*, is quite excellent.

'We retired after dinner to dress for the State ball. About 150 more people than were asked came to it, which was inconvenient, as we had asked about 850. The official list which was given to us amounted to 1,600.

'The dancing was in the tent. We had taken away the internal poles, and lighted it with 600 candles; the latter did not make the tent itself look very bright, but gave great brilliancy to the dancers.

'We had a beautiful parquet. The dancing was very animated. The Emperor danced without ceasing. I did not see the buffet and the sitting tables in the dining room; I am afraid it was rather a bear garden. Edmonds saw an officer carrying off a fine pine apple in his helmet.

'The supper for the Empress was as handsome as possible. The Duke's plate looked better than ever. We got the right people together for the Empress's table and two large round tables in the same room. The only fault was that there was too much to eat.

'I believe the ball was considered handsome and well done, but it was not so good as the little balls, which were the gayest yet given. *A propos* of dancing at the ball at the Kremlin, Lord Lincoln was

rather devoted to Miss Pearson, an American young lady. They agreed to dance a Polonaise. Just as they were beginning, they were frightened back by the approach of the Emperor. At that moment Prince Gortchakoff, the Minister of Foreign Affairs, came up and asked Miss Pearson to dance with him. She said she was engaged; he went to complain to the American Minister. The latter said she certainly had not recognised him. The Prince said she ought to have done so by his ribbon. The poor girl was violently scolded by the American Minister, who made her go the next day to apologise to the Minister.

'*September* 24.—There was a concert at the Grande Duchesse Hélène's. Nothing could go more glibly or be better arranged. In the middle of it a proverb was acted very well by Léontine Fay (Madame Volnys), by Mademoiselle Madeleine Brohan, and a French actor. It was clever, *comme il faut*, and full of point. It turned out to be the composition of Count Murat of the French Embassy (*Qui perd gagne*).

'I had a long talk with Gortchakoff, but we do not advance, and with the support of the French the Russians have rather the whip hand of us.

'*September* 26.—We went to another Imperial *chasse* beyond Petroffski. The lady riders were much augmented. It is become the fashion, and the Emperor evidently likes it. I mounted Madame de Benckendorff, who rides well; so does the Comtesse Strogonoff, so does not Princesse Troubetzkoi, and an unknown Russian lady. Princesse Bariatinski (Betsy) was on horseback, Olympe in a droshky. The Emperor has given Lady Stafford and Lady Emily Peel and me a pair of Russian greyhounds each, beautiful dogs with long hair, and very smart dog cloths embroidered with the Imperial arms.

'We lunched at Petroffski's, and half an hour afterwards gave a dinner on four little round tables to ten Austrians (it was to have been the night of their ball), and a quantity of Russian fashionables.

'In the evening we had a pretty concert at Morny's with Bosio.

'*September* 27.—Sights and shopping. In the evening the Austrian ball—very handsome. A beautiful *salle provisoire* with fountains, bosquets, &c. The young Austrians very active. It was superior to ours, but not so animated. I was very glad of the success.

'*September* 28.—The whole French Embassy dined with us and some Russians. In the evening the French ball, a magnificent fête. The decoration of the *salle provisoire* criticised, but I thought very pretty. Everything well arranged. The only drawback a bad floor with sticky wax. The supper well managed. Madame de

Seybach did the honours, as Princesse de Ligne had done for the Austrian Embassy.

'*September* 29.—Maude and I breakfasted at the Russian restaurants at a repast given by the Simon Woronzows, Troubetzkoi, and Paskiewitch to the Bruces and us. It was excellent in its way.

'In the evening we went to the fireworks, another national fête, which was to be the bouquet of the whole thing. I believe it would have been beautiful, but unfortunately there was a fog, which absolutely prevented anything being seen. We were all very sorry; not so the Turk, who was in the same compartment of the gallery with three Grand Dukes, the Nuncio and myself. He never ceased screaming: "Ah, quel dommage, c'est superbe, c'est magnifique, mais nous ne voyons rien. Ah, si on pouvait voir quelque chose ce serait superbe. Mais nous entendons beaucoup, nous entendons beaucoup." Then in a whisper to me, "Sébastopol, my Lord, Sébastopol," and then again at the top of his voice, "Ah, si nous pouvions voir quelque chose, mais quel dommage, on ne voit absolument rien. Ah, c'est si bien imaginé, ah, quel dommage," and so on for the half-hour during which it lasted.

'The Grand Dukes never spoke after Constantine had at the first moment prophesied what would happen. The Emperor must have been much annoyed, but carried off very well the disappointment.

'We took leave of the Empress. She has not much charm, and her small talk is very monotonous. I believe she has much character and is sensible and well-informed. She looks unhappy. Her crown fell from her head on the day of the coronation. "Preuve," she said, at the moment to Madame de Ribeaupierre, "que je ne la porterai pas longtemps."

'*September* 30.—I took leave of the Emperor to-day. His manner was charming, and nothing could be more complimentary than he was to Lady G., myself, and to the whole Embassy. His conversation on political matters was exactly the same as on the last occasion when I was alone with him. He must be a great actor if he is not an honest, well-intentioned man. I do not believe him to be equal to the great position which he now occupies. As yet he does not seem to have the talent of choosing the best men to carry out his benevolent designs. He has an immense respect for the memory of his father; still wears the aiguillettes of an aide-de-camp to show that he considers himself as continuing to act that part. He has received the education of a soldier, and is said to be quite ignorant of all that relates to the development of wealth in a country. He is anxious to impress upon the public that he has the decision of

character which marked his father, and which is replaced in him by a moderation and candour of which he is a little ashamed.

'There are great natural resources in Russia, but the machine is so complicated, and has been directed by so iron a hand, that it is doubtful what will now happen, particularly if the Emperor should prove not to have the strength and the perseverance to grapple with the universal corruption which is the bane of every branch of the administration.

'I have not given my views of the present state of Russia, but I do not think as highly of it as the generality of my diplomatic colleagues appear to do. One of the things against which I had to struggle was an attempt to make everything a personal question, to distinguish as between me and Wodehouse, between us and our Government, between the Government and the Queen, between Clarendon and Palmerston. I had a very sharp conversation with Gortchakoff about Wodehouse. Morny I have already described. We were excellent friends, and he behaved in a friendly, *comme il faut* manner to me all through the period of my mission. We liked Baudin, who was very civil to us, and is in fact a friend of the English alliance, which Morny is not. Baudin, as a good secretary of Embassy, was persuading me that I was wrong in thinking that Morny attached too much weight to the Russian alliance. I said, "But things do slip out, and your big General Lebœuf said to my wife yesterday, 'Moi je suis du parti Baudin, je suis tout pour l'alliance Anglaise.'"

'I am very glad to have seen it at all, and in so pleasant a way. I am glad to come away without the complete *fiasco* which I expected. My position as a complimentary Ambassador, and at the same time as a member of a Government which was doing and saying very irritating things to the Court to which I was accredited, was anomalous. Great efforts were made to separate me from Wodehouse, me from my Government, the Queen from the Government, Clarendon from Palmerston. All this of course I had to resist. I remained on excellent terms with Wodehouse.

'Palmerston and Clarendon have in my opinion been too scolding lately. They are at everybody. They have tried by bullying to get out of difficulties caused by carelessness in the negotiations. They have almost broken up the French alliance, which now only depends on what is its best security, upon the importance to his own interests which Louis Napoleon may attach to it. It is said that a really old Roman letter was sent to Walewski in the Roman hand itself. It is said that the latter has had an estate in Poland made over to him; but whatever the motives, it weakens us in the eyes of Europe, when our principal co-belligerent says that in a quarrel

in which we impute bad faith to Russia we are in the wrong, and the Russian Government in the right. I think also that we have got into a scrape by our interference at Naples, and we seem now to be yielding to the wise reluctance of the French to take strong measures. Clarendon has behaved to me in a very friendly straightforward manner. I am anxious to have a little talk with him on all these matters. My impression of Russia is that it has immense resources if they were properly developed, but that this will not be the case; that it is an immensely complicated machine, of which the governing wheels are not to be trusted and which having been kept at high pressure by a very energetic engineer, will certainly give somewhere or other in the hands of a very feeble one. If the present Emperor had ability, knowledge, energy, and the power of selecting good men, Russia would soon be again a very formidable Power. He is the contrary of all this, and I imagine that no real improvements will take place, but that there will be a general loosening of the reins of government, accompanied by a great increase in the universal corruption which pervades everything. I do not think my opinion is shared by my colleagues of the Corps Diplomatique, and it is quite possible that the false estimate of the power of Russia may give her as much weight in continental matters as her real strength. Their military exhaustion was complete in the last war. Their physical exhaustion less than was believed here. The English clergyman at Petersburg gave me a curious account of the suffering and discontent of the poorer classes in that town during the war. It is impossible to tell what is the real state of the finances in a country where there is nothing like publicity, but the Financial Minister is supposed to be very ignorant, as are also those around him. The liking, indeed the preference, shown by the population for paper money over gold and silver is a great facility for a needy Finance Minister, but may be productive of much evil. My conclusion is that Russia is not strong for aggression, that it is not necessary to make concessions to her which are in the least degree hurtful to ourselves, but that it is also desirable to be on friendly terms with her, as it is with all nations when there are not special reasons for the reverse.'

CHAPTER IX

THE CHINA WAR

1856–1857

ON his return to London from St. Petersburg, Lord Granville resumed his regular correspondence with Lord Canning.

LONDON, *November* 24, 1856.

'We stayed two days at Herrnsheim on our return, and three days at Paris. I saw Madame de Lieven, as fresh as a four-year-old. She pumped me with the force of a steam engine. I told her what I thought was good for her. I saw the Walewskis: very much annoyed at the run made at them in England. The strongest passion in Cowley's breast is hatred of Walewski. Persigny also detests him. The latter came over to turn him out. He very nearly succeeded, but I believe, thanks to articles dictated in Piccadilly to the *Times* and to the *Morning Post*, Walewski is firmer in his seat than ever. The detestation felt for us by all classes of politicians in France is beyond description. Luckily the Emperor is still convinced of the importance to himself of the English alliance. Palmerston has had a great success in Manchester and London. He is the master of the situation. I am not sure that Parliament will be quite so enthusiastic about the way we have been at everybody during the recess. Lord John is taking a *cure de neige* at Florence, as his skin is said to be thin at this moment. I am afraid that his health will suffer. Jem Wortley has accepted the Solicitor-Generalship.[1] The offer has displeased the legal profession at Brooks's, and the acceptance irritated Gladstone and Sidney Herbert.'

LONDON, *December* 2, 1856.

'Another beginning of Diary. I was asked to Windsor on Saturday. No other guest but Clarendon. The Queen looking active, very low indeed about her brother. She is anxious about the poor old Duchess of Kent, whom Brown, the Windsor doctor, thinks much

[1] The Right Hon. James Stuart Wortley, M.P.

shaken. The Princess Royal charming, and rather subdued in manner. Prince Albert thoughtful and very agreeable. He told me that Panmure had killed Lord Hardinge. Mars had invited the latter to break Lucan. Lord Hardinge refused, thinking Panmure in the wrong. He said that Panmure had provoked this observation of Lucan's by abuse of him while he was on his trial at Panmure's instigation, and that it was impossible to break Lucan for an observation made in self-defence. Mars had sworn at Hardinge, and threatened to turn the whole press loose upon him. The Prince described Hardinge's presence of mind during his last attack as very remarkable. He joked and tried to reassure the Queen till she was taken away, and was then carried off by the Prince and General Wetherall.[1]

'I had a long talk with Stockmar, who is a confirmed hypochondriac, but very agreeable. I told him that I thought there was a great reaction against Nicholas in Russia. He told me a story which confirmed this opinion. A Protestant clergyman had preached a sermon, in which he accused his audience of wrong behaviour in having treated their Emperor as a demigod during his life, which he did not deserve, and of having abused him more than he deserved since his death. He was questioned by the Director of Police, and finally by the present Emperor, concerning the sermon. He said it was true, that he had not chosen his text, that it had been chosen for him: "Where the carcase is, there the eagles gather together." He had preached according to his text, and in the manner he thought most truthful and best adapted to do good to his congregation. The Emperor praised him for the way in which he had followed the dictates of his conscience, and said that he would always find a supporter in him. Stockmar thinks that we are the only nation which is sound in Europe. He cannot praise us equally in foreign matters, in which as a nation we are vain, prejudiced, arrogant, awkward, and ignorant. All the accounts he had heard of Russia tallied with mine. He thinks Louis Napoleon's throne a very unstable one. Prussia and Austria he believes to be in much danger.

'To-day I saw poor Ellesmere, who looks very ill, and who is, I am afraid, dying.[2] If he had had a little more devil in him, he would have been a very remarkable man. I dined with the Chancellor at a reconciliation dinner between Lords Campbell and Wensleydale. Lord

[1] Lord Hardinge had a sudden seizure while at Windsor, and died shortly after.

[2] Second son of George Granville, Marquis of Stafford, and better known as Lord Francis Leveson-Gower; was Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant in 1828; raised to the peerage in 1846.

Lyndhurst was asked, and said he would come. "A couple of d——d fools, eh?" He unfortunately found he was engaged to Baron Alderson. Wensleydale said to Jock upon shaking hands with him, "All is forgotten." Jock replied, "There is nothing to forget." Wensleydale swung round on his heel, saying, "I have plenty to forget." They were (injudiciously) placed next to one another at dinner, and never spoke till *soufflé* time, when they relaxed and began to converse.[1]

'*December* 3.—Another of Lord Melbourne's: "The Queen hates Church faces. Lady —— has a d——d Church face." Met Henry Liddell in the street; he told me that he had been dangerously ill. He recommended Arthur Stanley for the Professorship of Ecclesiastical History vacant by Hussey's death. A Cabinet dinner. Conversation about a Bill giving Prince Albert rank above the Prince of Wales. Clarendon and I think it rash, but it has been approved by the leaders of all parties, and is to be proposed soon after the meeting. Much conversation about Persia.[2] Clarendon uneasy. The attacks in the press evidently alarm him. Lady G. had a brilliant drum in the next room.

'*December* 5.—Among the persons sneered at on Wednesday evening for mismanagement about Herat was the Governor-General. Vernon Smith muttered, but was cowed by Clarendon, who was in a thundering bad humour. I boiled, but knowing nothing on earth of the case thought it prudent to hold my tongue. Yesterday and to-day I have looked at the papers, and as soon as the Cabinet were all assembled this afternoon, I said I wished to make a few remarks upon the conversation which had taken place on Wednesday night; that I had since had an opportunity of looking at the papers, which appeared to me conclusive, although there was probably still more to be said on your side of which I was not aware; that the three points on which some censure had been intimated were: "your having been slow in sending arms to Dost Mohammed; your having stinted the expeditionary force; and your having stopped the sending of officers to Herat." That with regard to the last, I found the order was not absolute but discretionary; that it left upon you the onus of deciding whether it was desirable to send them or not. I then repeated from memory but with perfect accuracy the reasons stated by you in writing for not sending them.

'The second point was with regard to the number of the expedition.

[1] Lord Campbell had been prominent in the attacks on Lord Wensleydale's right to take his seat in the House of Lords with a life peerage.

[2] On October 25, 1856, the Persians seized Herat, to which the claims of Dost Mohammed were recognised by Great Britain. A rupture took place, and eventually war broke out. General Outram defeated the Persians at Kooshab and Mohammerah in February and March 1857.

You received orders to send a force to take possession of Karack and Bushire: no more. It was true that Somerset had recommended a larger number, but Somerset was not supposed to be a Duke of Wellington. All Indian authorities in this country thought 5,000 quite sufficient for the above-mentioned purpose. That the great difficulty in these enterprises was the Commissariat, which was proportionately increased by additional numbers; that it was clear that you, like Dalhousie and others who knew the country well, thought India too much denuded of troops; that you were determined not to add to this evil, and that you were a very unlikely person to have neglected the warning afforded by Newcastle, and send away all your available men, keeping no reserve. With regard to delay in sending arms to Dost Mohammed, I found that the order was signed in London on July 10, and executed in Calcutta by you on August 18; that this order was a change of policy, a change deprecated by the Cabinet itself earlier in the year, which it was impossible for you to make until the order was sent out; that if there was any blame, that blame must attach to the Home Government. I was pleased with my own statement, which was easy and colloquial, and still more so with the way it was received. Lord Smith regained courage, spoke well, and stated how admirably you had done. Pam chimed in, and Clarendon behaved well, saying he had not meant to throw any blame upon you, and that he was bound to say that with respect to stopping the officers from going to Herat, Outram thought you were quite right. Everyone else seemed to be of the same opinion. All is well that ends well. We had yesterday one of the pleasantest dinners I ever remember, only Pahlen, Bruce, Sneyd, and ourselves.

'*December* 7.—Had a dinner which turned out pleasant: we thought it congruous to invite Lady Stuart and the Vernon Smiths together. The former very well, and in great spirits. Sir David Dundas,[1] whom G. Lewis calls the *fanfaron de la vertu*, agreeable; ditto Sneyd. Poor Shelburne has sprained his ankle at tennis. He is working hard, and praised by Clarendon and Hammond. Ch. Villiers is going as Minister to the United States.

'*December* 8.—Staffords dined, Sneyd and Norman, Quin and Pahlen in the evening, very pleasant. A story by Quin of D'Orsay. "It is a d——d shame, Saunders and Ottley. Lady Blessington, the lady who lives at Kensington Gore, is a first-class subscriber, and you send her nothing but dam old books. I will not stand it. It is a d——d shame. D——n." A respectable individual presents himself from behind the desk, remonstrates at the use of such

[1] Sir David Dundas, Solicitor-General in Lord John Russell's Administration, but better known for his literary tastes and social popularity.

personal language, and intimates that the money will be returned, and the engagement broken off. "My dear friend, I do not mean to make it a personal question: if you are Saunders, d——n Ottley; if you are Ottley, d——n Saunders."'

LONDON, *December* 24, 1856.

'I wish you and the Viscountess a great many happy returns of the year. We left Wilton on the 13th, after what was certainly a pleasant party.

'I had no political talk with Herbert. There were a few allusions of rather an angry character against Pam's bishops, but he does not mind, and they are generally popular. Lord Campbell congratulated Shaftesbury on the class from which they were appointed. He received the congratulations with triumph and boasted that all the Dissenters would soon join the Church of England. "Yes," said Jock, "and all the Church of England men leave it." There is no doubt that the last appointment, Bickersteth, was a mistake. Church appointments ought to give no party a triumph. At the same time I believe that a bishopric has anything rather than a tendency to lower the previous creed of the person who occupies it. Talking of appointments, I have been made Chancellor of the University of London, after a great fight on my part, and some delay. John Lefevre was the guilty party. He persuaded George Grey that I should be the best. It was offered to Lord John, to Brougham, and to the Duke of Somerset. There are to be some new men on the Council, among others Lord Stanley (not Ben).

'London as usual is very pleasant, but we tore ourselves away to pay the Fullertons a visit in their new cottage at Slindon. Nothing can be prettier. The spot is charming, and they have furnished an old cottage with all their pretty things. It makes Golder's Green, my farm, sing very small. *A propos* of the latter, Bruce asked Charles Greville what he thought of it. "Well," said Charles, "there it is." I am passionately fond of it. I hope the plaything will last, as it is very healthy riding down to it. Rivers is the only friend who shares my feelings, but when they have eaten the butter and drunk some of the curious old sherry which is going there, it will become more popular. There is unfortunately not much character about it. It is a modern whitewashed small unpretending house, close to the roadside. The view from some of my fields is lovely. Tom Mason has often killed his six brace of birds on it on September 1.

'The Russian question will soon be settled, and I believe without a Conference. We shall give them a large tract of land not giving them more access to the Pruth, and none to the Danube; they

giving up both Bolgrads, the Serpent's Island, and the Delta to the Turks instead of Moldavia.[1]

'Washington has been offered to Charles Villiers, who will not have it. Napier is to have it. I am rather for the offer being made to Elgin. There should be no delay in sending out some one, as it would lose all its grace if the Americans have time to complain of one not being sent. Our policy and circumstances have placed him on a pedestal. I am wading through four hundred pages of Persian Blue Book which begins too late, and as far as I can see has no Board of Control papers. I hope it will be patched up. Outram was strong against some of our conditions, and said that no Oriental potentate would submit to them. It is unlucky for the peacemakers that the terms objected to by Outram are just those which have been accepted by the Persian Ambassador at Constantinople.

'The Neufchâtel question is exciting much interest in Europe, less here. I have no idea of King Cliquot being such a fool as to invade Switzerland.[2] If he does, his army will get a licking. The Swiss are better prepared than they ever were, and I am told that they have at this moment some very able men at the head of their Government. It was lucky that I refused when in the Foreign Office to sign the protocol about Neufchâtel, which Malmesbury agreed to sign, and which to a certain degree pledges us.[3] If we had acted cordially with the French, we might have arranged this quarrel.[4] Cowley and Walewski are now on the most mellifluous terms, which is lucky, as Persigny has lost all his influence with the Emperor.

'*Frognal, December* 26.—We came here yesterday, and I wish you and Lady Canning a great many happy Christmases. It seems to us a long dreary four years to wait. I suppose you are so busy that you have hardly time to think of it. My removal from office has been the great *canard* of the month of December. Some send me to Paris, some to Ireland. I have been pestered for aide-de-camp-ships. Clarendon told me yesterday that he had a note from Delane, complaining of his not being informed of the secession of Charles Wood,

[1] The reference is to Article XX. of the Treaty of Paris, relating to the new frontier of Russia in Bessarabia. The points in question were finally settled by a protocol signed at Paris on January 6, 1857, and a treaty signed on June 19 of the same year.

[2] 'Cliquot' was a nickname by which the King of Prussia was known.

[3] In 1852.

[4] In 1856 the Prussian party in Neufchâtel, headed by Count de Pourtalès, rebelled against the Republic, but the insurrection was put down, and the leaders imprisoned with a view of bringing them to trial. War was thereupon threatened by the King of Prussia, who under the Treaty of Vienna was Prince of Neufchâtel, and possessed certain privileges which the protocol signed in 1852 by England, France, and Austria had recognised.

Panmure, and me from the Cabinet. My health is as good as restored. I believe Pam wishes to make no change. Some wish to have Johnny in the House of Lords. If this is done, I should at once consent. I should decline continuing to lead, with him in office in the House of Lords. If he took my place, ought I to take Paris, if it was offered to me? Your advice would probably arrive in time for practical purposes. I suspect, however, that Pam thinks Johnny is safer out of his Government than in it.

'All Frognal[1] (Pahlen, Quin, Lady Adelaide Cadogan, Lady Augusta ditto, Charles Greville), that is to say those who have not written, send you both their very best love and wishes.

'Yours, G.'

THE GROVE, *January* 22, 1857.

'MY DEAR CANNING,—There is no possible plan but the journal plan. I cannot remember where I last left off, or whether I told you that we went to Trentham on the 30th, where we found nobody but the Duke, the Duchess, the Staffords, Lady Blantyre, and Pahlen. Poor Sneyd too ill with chest to be able to come. It was pleasant, as Trentham always is. The Duchess gets more simple and more agreeable every year. They are both in great sorrow about poor Ellesmere, who, I should think, will not live many months. He had rallied but got worse again. I found things going on pretty well at Shelton.[2] I am very much pleased with my commercial manager, Wragge. . . .

'After Trentham we went to Windsor, where the Queen and Prince Albert were very gracious to my wife and self. The latter consulted me much about the Prince of Wales. I should have liked to discuss the matter with you, before giving any opinion. I strongly recommended his being mixed up with others of his own age away from home. The visits of Eton boys to the Castle for a couple of hours can be of no use. I questioned the Prince closely about Gibbs. He thinks very highly of Gibbs. He sent for him, and made him give me his views on the education of the Prince. This Gibbs did in a very clear and sensible way. He talked of the advantages and disadvantages of being Prince of Wales in a very uncourtierlike manner. I believe that a journey will be organised for him, and several boys of his own age invited to accompany him. It is intended to send him for a short time to Oxford and Cambridge, and then on a voyage to all the principal British possessions. You will possibly have to receive him; hardly so.[3]

[1] Lord Sydney's place in Kent.

[2] A mineral property in Staffordshire belonging to Lord Granville.

[3] Owing to the expiry of the Governor-General's term of office.

'The Queen is much excited about a Bill to give the Prince precedence over the Prince of Wales. I asked Stockmar to use his influence to stop it. He agrees with me, but says he has been fighting it for sixteen years.

'*January* 26.—After Windsor we went to Bowood. You will find poor Flahault an altered man on your return. He is much broken, and threatened with a stroke. Shelburne has got a stiff leg from a strain at tennis, still devoted to the Foreign Office and its work. All England and Europe are ringing with indignation at a speech of Sir R. Peel's, which you should read as a marvellous specimen of everything that ought not to have been said. It is said that he thinks he has made a hit. I hear he has never been near the Admiralty since his return.[1] I believe Palmerston has sent him a reprimand, but no dismissal, which people in general think ought to have been done. It is painful for me. I am glad you committed yourself to an approval of his appointment. After Bowood, we went to Savernake. Kerry-Gores, Pahlen, Ben, Clanricarde, Chreptovitch, and Johnny Bushe. I never saw anyone so surprised as Chrep,[2] who has been accustomed to calm English society, when he found himself in the middle of the two Irishmen Ben and Bruce's talk. We were at the Grove last week. We met the Apponyis, whom we like, she very *grande dame*; the Chreps, she very tiresome; Chelsea, Ch. Villiers always pleasant, Villiers Lister, and Gerald Ponsonby. Clarendon is less pleasant in his own house than elsewhere, he whips himself up so violently. We have received the intelligence of Persia yielding.[3] It does not seem quite certain, but one cannot help believing such good news. The war was a great scrape. I hear Gladstone and Graham are very great about Muley Hakim. I have great doubts whether it is the best policy to treat Orientals in a way inconsistent with all the principles of justice, but I ought not to say so to you, as all your impulses would be in favour of my heresy. I hope we shall get well out of the Chinese scrape. William Cowper is my vice-president.

'I am childishly fond of my farm. It will be impossible to attend to the House of Lords in the hay-making season. What a pleasure it will be to show it to you. It is frightful.'

From the contemplation of the beauties of the 'farm,' Lord Granville was abruptly called away early in 1857 by a great parliamentary crisis. The seizure of the lorcha Arrow and the conduct of Dr. Bowring, her Majesty's Consul, in

[1] Sir Robert Peel was then Secretary to the Admiralty.
[2] Count Chreptovitch, Russian Ambassador.
[3] Peace was signed with Persia in April 1857.

demanding redress from the Chinese authorities, led to protracted debates in both Houses of Parliament. A coalition between the followers of Lord Derby, the Peelites, and the more advanced section of Liberal opinion, defeated the Government on the third of March. A dissolution immediately followed, and the country confirmed the tenure of office of Lord Palmerston and his colleagues by sending a large majority to support him at Westminster against what was regarded as a faction.

LORD GRANVILLE TO LORD CANNING.

LONDON, *March* 10, 1857.

'MY DEAR CANNING,—Many thanks for your letter. Mrs. Anson is come, and a pretty account she gives of you, working all day and night, taking no exercise, and never going away. She says that all the old Indians say that no constitution can stand it. Now this is really foolish. What good will it do if you come back with broken health, having succumbed in the attempt to do that which no one can do? You should let some one else do a portion of your work; anything better than get regularly jaded. I asked how you were liked. She says very much, that you are thought more inclined to pick other people's brains than to announce your own opinions. That you were rather long in forming a decision: inflexible when once your mind was made up. This appears to me to be high praise.

'Clanricarde is more or less active as an Indian reformer. It annoys the Opposition, but he is supported by Grey and Albemarle. I expected a long debate on the double Government, and prepared a long speech to glorify the present Governor-General, but the debate came to a close, Argyll having made an excellent speech in reply. Ellenborough says, "Vernon Smith is a fool, a d——d fool; why don't they make the Duke of Argyll President of the Board of Control? He is a clever little fellow." He said Vernon complained to me that his borough wanted something even less aristocratic than himself. "Yes," Ben interposed, "they want a shoemaker."[1] *He* seems to do his work well in the House, but is of no use as a general debater. He never opens his mouth.

'You will be excited by the news of the crisis. You will probably think the Opposition right in their estimate of the Doctor's proceedings at Canton, but you will also judge that they have acted

[1] Mr. Vernon Smith represented Northampton.

most foolishly, and have contrived to help Palmerston over a very difficult session. There were awkward questions coming, particularly as before an expiring House of Commons. He is a little gouty, and his gout tells upon his speaking. It did so particularly in the China debate. I luckily got provoked by the gross exaggeration of the opposite side, and am supposed to have spoken better than I usually do in answer to Ellenborough. I had nearly forgotten to tell you that I am to have the Garter. Pam offered it in a very polite way, saying that I must not refuse it, as it was the Queen's spontaneous suggestion. People seem not to disapprove.

'The whole country in England and Scotland is Palmerstonian. The Government are going too fiercely against many people who for conscience sake voted against them.

'I am trying to get Johnny Acton in for some place in Ireland. I am glad to find that, although he is only a moderate Whig, he is also a very moderate Catholic.

'Elgin, like the stormy petrel, has appeared for the first time in London, and is wonderfully courteous to me. People think Gladstone mad, which is of course false, but he certainly is in an extraordinary state of excitement. His speech on the China debate was one of the finest ever heard in the House of Commons.

'If feasible, turn the opium monopoly into a tax, and do something to meet the complaints of the missionaries as to the condition of the natives in Bengal.'

PARIS, *April* 8, 1857.

'I have missed a great many days and weeks, which ought to have afforded ample materials for a letter. The last part of the parliamentary session was busy for me, and I think I have quite regained the ground which I believe I had lost. I had to answer a speech of Derby's, which was his manifesto to the electors. I was aggressive, pleased my friends, and much displeased Malmesbury and his late colleagues. They would hardly speak to me, when I met them at Lady Jersey's. Palmerston has had a great triumph. The elections have turned, as you will see in the papers, entirely on him personally, and we have gained nearly forty, *independent of Government Liberals*, who have turned out Bright and Milner Gibson, and so on. The danger consists in the probable formation of a numerous and respectable Liberal party opposed to the present Government. The game is not an easy one for anybody as regards Reform. If Johnny produces a Bill, he will be smashed, as it is almost impossible to concoct one which will please everybody. The House of Commons is sure to be apathetic about Reform.[1] The country does

[1] The new Parliament met on April 30, 1857.

not care a great deal about it, but would be very angry if it was thought that the Government was anti-reforming. I believe Palmerston is reasonable on this point, and is likely to show more tact than Johnny. If so, the game seems as safe as his age will allow it to be.

'The Peelites are smashed as a party, which is good. Gladstone is in a state of unnatural excitement, and instead of calming himself by rest, he has been making violent speeches in every public-house in Flintshire. Graham has made the most Radical speech which has yet been made. Sidney Herbert will be on the Liberal side, somewhere between Lord John and Palmerston. He talks of going abroad. Newcastle has declared himself a Liberal. It is said that much rising talent has been shown at the elections. Lords Cavendish and Althorp both very good,[1] ditto Robert Grosvenor's son. Lord Lincoln not bad. Poor Freddy is dreadfully disappointed by his failure in the Potteries. He was outjockeyed by Ricardo. I got here on Sunday evening, dined at the Laferronays, where I met Frederick Lagrange, who is busy in buying *percherons* (French posthorses) for the farm at Golder's Green, and the Curé de la Madeleine, who would hold his own with Samuel of Oxford. I called after dinner on the Cowleys, where I found the Sydneys, and I had the pleasure of announcing to Lady Cowley that the Queen had signed the warrant for her husband's earldom.[2] I then went to Mrs. F. Baring, where I met Mérimée, Hertford, and Cavaignac. I unluckily did not make out the last. The conversation was not political, but chiefly on books. Mérimée said that to get the most famous bookbinder, Barbazan, to bind a book in a simple way for fifty francs a volume, it was necessary to call on him, to refer to one's ancient friendship, offer to be godfather to the next child, &c. Hertford expressed great pleasure at the way the elections were going in England.[3] I do not know whether he was laughing at me. On Monday I paid some visits. Poor Madame de Lieven makes a great blank, both as regards herself and her salon, which is unreplaceable and unreplaced. Madame Walewska is looking well, and was glad when I gave her messages from Pam and Clarendon for her husband. Walewski defends himself, and declares that he and the Emperor are the greatest friends in France to the English alliance. He says that it was impossible to have gone

[1] The allusion is to the present Duke of Devonshire and to the present Lord Spencer.

[2] Lord Cowley had declined a step in the peerage in the previous year; he was created Earl Cowley and Viscount Dangan on April 4, 1857.

[3] Lord Hertford lived in Paris; he was the owner of Bagatelle on the edge of the Bois de Boulogne.

on with the war in Russia, and maintained the English alliance. The only difficulty he now foresees is the question of uniting or not the Principalities. In the original draft of what should be settled at the Conference, Walewski, merely in order to obtain an opinion, proposed the union. Clarendon concurred; afterwards it was settled at the Conference that the opinions of the Divans summoned for the purpose should be taken, and France, having the belief that the union was not disagreeable to England, pronounced herself openly in favour of it. Walewski now understood that England, convinced by Austria, as Turkey already had been, was strongly against the union. He hoped that the position of affairs would be calmly considered by Clarendon. If the Divans pronounce in favour of the present state of things, France would immediately acquiesce. If they give a doubtful answer, she will acquiesce; but if they are strongly in favour of union, France, Russia, Prussia, and Sardinia will be strongly in favour of that which is the declared wish of the Principalities themselves, whilst England, Turkey, and Austria would be the other way, and great difficulties would arise.[1] He believes that the Swiss affair will be settled, and sees no other difficulties at present.

'The Orleanists are in a very bitter and dissatisfied state. They see no possible change at present. They are all excepting Thiers frantic against England. The Fusion has been knocked on the head by the Orleanist Princes asking the Duke of Bordeaux what he means to do as to the colour of his flag (white or tricolor) and as to the grant of a constitution. Henry V. refuses to pledge himself till the occasion presents itself, and the Fusion appears impossible, much to the satisfaction of Thiers, who has always prophesied that it was impossible for an exclusive aristocracy, who have learned nothing and who are incorrigible, to coalesce with a *bourgeoisie* which is democratic.[2]

'We dined with the Emperor yesterday evening. I sat next to the Empress, who is easy to get on with. She inquired of me what sort of person the Empress of Russia was. I said that I believed that she was clever and well-informed, but that I had never heard her ask anything but whether one had danced much at the last ball. "Mais voyez-vous," said Eugénie, "it is not easy always to find questions to ask." I had a long talk with the Emperor in the evening. He was civil and pleasant, looked very low, and is evidently much preoccupied by the action of the secret societies and the plots for

[1] Under the Treaty of Paris there were to be two Hospodars elected by the Divans, one for Wallachia, the other for Moldavia, under the suzerainty of Turkey.

[2] This prophecy fulfilled itself in the famous letter of February 1873, by which the Comte de Chambord finally destroyed the last hopes of the Fusionists by refusing to compromise the question of the flag.

assassination. He has a vague wish to resettle Europe, and thinks it might be done by a cordial understanding between Russia, England, and France. He talked of the want of civil courage in France, and the ease with which the cause of his Government was given up as lost by some of his best friends, when he was slightly unpopular during the last autumn. He was evidently, although he denies it, rather taken in by Dizzy. I recommended him to ask "Tamarang," who is coming here, what he thought of Dizzy, and by his answers to judge of what might be expected in the way of harmony and consistency from a Tory Government.[1] He declares that his wish is to see Lord Palmerston's Government consolidated. He talked of the difficulty of his conduct with respect to financial measures. There was much immediate danger in adopting our system of allowing people to do as they liked; and on the other hand great difficulty in teaching them what they ought to do. The evening ended by a lecture on table turning, &c., in which the Emperor and Empress believe. A certain Mr. Hume produces hands, raises heavy tables four feet from the ground with a finger, knocks on the Emperor's hand from a distance. The Emperor is rather pleased at the table coming more to him than to others; but seeing Lady G. and me look incredulous, he broke off saying, "They think us mad, and Lord Granville will report that the alliance is on a most unstable footing." 'Yours, G.'

By his speech in introducing the Life Peerages Bill, and his conduct of the measure, Lord Granville had greatly increased his reputation. An almost equally difficult question arose in the new Parliament to test yet further the ability of the new Liberal leader. The condition of the law of England in regard to marriage and divorce had long been the opprobrium and scandal of the age. But arrayed against any reform was a phalanx of popular prejudice, with powerful representatives in the House of Commons, who had lay and clerical allies so strongly entrenched in the House of Lords that all hopes of any alteration seemed well nigh desperate. Wit and humour have before now triumphed where reason has failed to persuade. At the Warwick Assizes in 1845 Mr. Justice Maule in a leading case, in passing sentence on a prisoner convicted of bigamy, used all the resources of a mordant

[1] The allusion is to Lord Malmesbury, who was known by the above nickname.

irony to illustrate the absurdity and injustice of the existing system of law, and undoubtedly drove home thereby the arguments which on their merits had failed to secure attention. From that moment the movement in favour of change steadily gained strength.

In 1856 the Government had taken up the question, but a difference between the two Houses prevented the Bill passing, and when it was reintroduced in 1857 it became the object on the part of Mr. Gladstone of an opposition so pertinacious, that his conduct was afterwards made the basis of a charge, that he was the real inventor and original patentee of the art of parliamentary obstruction. In the House of Lords the Chancellor had to contend with a band of ex-Chancellors who sat on the benches opposite, and with the Bench of Bishops. The struggle might have proved unequal, but the Government was fortunate in one respect. The greatest of all the ex-Chancellors, Lord Lyndhurst, had recognised the necessity of change, and at more than one critical moment came to the rescue of the hard-pressed Liberal leader and Lord Cranworth. Largely owing to his assistance, the Bill passed, and when, after a fierce and prolonged struggle in the Lower House, it was returned in August with amendments to the House of Lords, it was believed to be substantially safe.

In the condition of parties as they then existed the Government at that late period of the session possessed as a rule the command of the House, for the accession of many peers from the Tory party at the time of the repeal of the Corn Laws had materially weakened the Opposition. There was therefore a practical certainty that if a fair discussion of the amendments after proper notice could be secured, the Bill would become law. But on the 20th, the very night the amended Bill was returned to the House, Lord Redesdale, aware of the situation, gave notice that he would next day move that the amendments should be taken into consideration that day six months ; and accordingly on the 21st, seizing his opportunity in an almost empty House, in which at the moment there happened to be a small Conservative majority

present, he rose to make the motion, of which practically the House had received nothing but the barest and most technical notice. The situation was one which placed the leader of the Liberal party in a situation where the command of his own temper was far more important than the command of the Whig legionaries. Lord Redesdale was Chairman of the Committees of the House, one of the recognised oracles on public business, and bound by virtue of his office to resist everything which might be described as *contra bonos mores et decorum*. But there he was setting an example which might have scandalised the smallest clerk in the humblest solicitor's office in a country town in his own county of Worcester. Nevertheless for the leader of the House to suggest to Lord Redesdale an intimation that such was the case, was evidently a very delicate matter; yet it had to be done, and done without provoking a struggle, for the only chance of saving the Bill was to appeal to the dangerous nature of the precedent which Lord Redesdale was proposing to set. The character of the House, Lord Granville urged, was at stake; it had always been observed 'as almost a religious principle' not to take petty advantages that might be gained by a surprise, but to adopt fair and straightforward steps to bring any matter before the House. He put it to Lord Redesdale whether, in his office as Chairman of Committees, he would have approved in another peer the course he himself was now pursuing.

'It is perfectly monstrous [he ended by declaring] that we should be asked to reject the Commons' amendments before they have even been printed and subjected to our examination, and I cannot think that my noble friend, to whom in his official position we look up for guidance on questions affecting the regularity of our proceedings, will persist in his intention. I hope that this House will not subject itself in the eyes of the country to the imputation of seeking by a mere trick to get rid of an important measure.'

The appeal struck a responsive chord, and if from no other motive but very shame, Lord Redesdale was at length obliged to withdraw. Lord Granville got the adjournment of the House carried, and on the following Monday, the 24th

Lord Redesdale's amendment was discussed and defeated, but only by two votes. The Commons' amendments were then agreed to. Thus was the Bill rescued and this great reform by a narrow majority placed on the Statute Book.[1] The Republican form of government in France is said to have been saved by similar good luck when in 1874, after interminable debates and endless obstruction, an amendment was carried by one vote, that the words 'République Française' should be inserted in a clause of the Constitution then under discussion. The venerable deputy, M. Wallon, who was better known at the time as a Professor of History at the Sorbonne than as a politician, moved the insertion and obtained immortality, living ever after as 'Le Père de la République.' It was related at the time that the President, Marshal MacMahon, who desired anything except the success of the amendment, in a burst of passion ordered his aide-de-camp to find the deputy—*ce maudit numéro un*—whose vote had settled the question, and bring him before him. The aide-de-camp sought to explain to the irate Marshal that, as all votes were equal, it was not possible to identify anybody in particular as representing the fatal number. Whether Lord Redesdale made an analogous search for the two peers who in the British Parliament on that late night in August saved the Divorce and Matrimonial Causes Bill from destruction, is not known; but could they be identified they would be as worthy of a niche in the Temple of Fame as the solitary deputy who was the object of the abortive inquisition made at a later period of history by the Marshal and his clerical allies in France.

Such encounters as this with Lord Redesdale were, however, exceptional. The principal parliamentary antagonist whom Lord Granville had to face at this time and for the ten succeeding years was Lord Derby, one of the acknowledged masters of English eloquence and the despot of the House of Lords, who held proxies just as he owned racehorses; and owing as some thought to the latter class of associations, was never over much troubled in his conduct of public business with any inconvenient regard either for the

[1] *Hansard*, third series, cxlvii. 1965, 1968

feelings of his antagonists or for the unwritten understandings of public life: especially when he saw an opportunity of dishing his quondam Whig friends and allies. A witty antagonist once said that he had 'Newmarketised' the House, and the phrase lived.

'I remember asking M. Guizot [Lord Granville said during one of these debates] who was his most formidable opponent in the old Chamber of Deputies. He said: "M. Thiers; but if you had put the question in a different form, I should have named another person. If you had asked me: 'who is the most difficult member to answer?' I should have named a very eminent orator and a great poet, who speaks for an hour or more amid tremendous cheers, and at the end of that time I do not know what facts I have to deal with, and what arguments I have to refute."'[1]

The eloquence of Lord Derby, for the same reasons as that of M. de Lamartine, was often difficult to answer. But it frequently happened that even if the 'Rupert of debate' might at first have seemed to be sweeping everything before him in a torrent of discursive eloquence, in which the iniquities of Lord Clarendon's foreign policy, the wickedness of the plans of Lord John Russell to destroy the Constitution to secularise education and plunder the Church, and the dangers of the law reforms of the Chancellor, were all mixed up together in a lava flood of consuming wrath, it was none the less his ill fortune to discover, like his famous military prototype, that while still fancying the victory his own on the wide field over which his triumphant eloquence ranged, he had had his retreat cut off and his argumentative stores captured by a deft stroke in an unexpected quarter from the smooth antagonist who sat smiling opposite. With Lord Derby sat Lord Ellenborough, whose comparatively rare appearances in debate had nevertheless earned for him a reputation as an orator superior even to Lord Derby, for he had inherited much of the peculiar eloquence of his celebrated father, the Lord Chief Justice, that eloquence which Bentham described as 'commanding, fierce, and atrocious,' and stigmatised as an 'abomination.'[2] Facing Lord Derby

[1] *Hansard*, ccxxxviii. 1721. [2] C. M. Atkinson, *Jeremy Bentham*, p. 157.

and Lord Ellenborough there sat on the Liberal benches with Lord Granville many statesmen of experience and distinction; but none, with the exception of the Duke of Argyll, who even aspired to the claim of being an orator, or, till the appearance there of Lord Russell in 1861, a great debater with an established reputation. The debating power of the Liberal party was elsewhere—on the benches of the House of Commons. But an additional and more disturbing element than even the superiority as orators of Lord Derby and Lord Ellenborough, was the presence in the House of Lords of an unusual number of ex-ministers of great ability, outside the ranks of the recognised Opposition, who never hesitated to use their independent privileges with freedom, in order to deal faithfully—though, as they wished it to be understood, regretfully and only at the call of public duty—with the ministers of the day, of whom they had all, or nearly all, at one time or another, been the colleagues. Lord Grey, then in the zenith of his remarkable powers, which have left so insufficient a mark on the page of English history, was commencing the persistent but barren course of criticism in which, as Lord Granville once playfully observed, he displayed 'his infinite power and fertility in raising objections to any course which was not precisely that which he had shaped himself.'[1] Lord Brougham still prowled over the field of political battle, ready at any moment to deliver a damaging flank attack; while his old rival, Lord Lyndhurst, whose formidable powers of opposition had largely contributed to the destruction of the Governments of Lord Melbourne and Lord John Russell, was still in his place on the red benches, and ready at times to join in attack with energies which neither time seemed to impair, nor age to diminish; though it must be admitted that he seemed far less anxious to do so since Lord Granville sat as leader opposite.

It was the delight of the Roman populace to watch the struggles in the arena of combatants whose arms and weapons of offence and defence were of the most dissimilar kind

[1] *Hansard*, third series, cxcii. 2023.

A contest between Lord Granville and Lord Derby may well recall the encounter of the *retiarius* and the *mirmillo*, when the former armed with a net sought to baffle the formidable onset of the latter armed with a sword. Lord Granville would have been the last person to claim the reputation of a slashing orator. Not his were the stately exordium, the fierce attack, the passionate invective, and the moving peroration of his great rival, which, if they thrilled with slightly wasted power through the comparatively chill atmosphere of the House of Lords, nevertheless often constituted an appeal, even when only read next day, almost as formidable as if they had been addressed direct to the electors of the country, at a time when nobody had yet thought of comparing a debate in the House of Lords to 'addressing dead men by torchlight.'[1] Never in the whole of his long career did Lord Granville in these respects rashly court a comparison with his great antagonist. But his powers of exposition and statement were considerable, and he had the art of reproducing correctly and forcibly any information that was given him. Above all he possessed tact, good humour, and courtesy, which are the arms most necessary in the leader of a minority. In him these were inborn gifts, which practice only rendered more perfect, and it was with them that he faced Lord Derby and Lord Ellenborough, neither despondent nor irritable, never failing in good humour or serenity, and master 'of all the courtesies of combat and subtleties of defence.' 'You could not fail to notice,' said a frequent observer, 'how pleasantly he saluted his antagonist before engaging him, how happily he quoted him against himself'—in the case of Lord Derby it was fortunately easy to do so—'how smilingly he came up to the encounter, how unruffled was his air throughout, and how easy the anecdote or illustration with which he made his final thrust and took his leave of the discussion.'[2]

[1] A phrase said to have been used by Mr. Lowe after he had addressed the House of Lords for the first time as Viscount Sherbrooke.

[2] *Scotsman*, April 1, 1891.

Lord Granville was of a sanguine nature—the expression occurs again and again in his letters; and he never gave up a battle for lost until the last shot was fired, and it was absolutely certain that no help even from the most unexpected quarter was going to arrive. It frequently would happen that the antagonist who imagined that he had altogether got the best of it, and that the Liberal leader had really nothing left to say for himself, would at the last moment find himself punctured with a light thrust which had unexpectedly got in between the joints of his armour, just when he was thinking the struggle over and the battle won. You might then see Lord Granville quietly sit down without adding another word which might diminish the effect of the epigram, or mar the polish of some gentle but none the less telling gibe, which occasionally made persons of a coarse and vulgar nature feel that 'after all they ought to be ashamed of themselves, and regret that they had spoken.'[1] 'Did you hear Pussy scratch?' Sir Charles Wood was said to have once observed at the bar of the House after one of these encounters. The phrase became proverbial. If the best had to be made of an almost impossible situation—and such situations were very frequent in the House of Lords—Lord Granville knew exactly how to do it, for in debate he never lacked self-possession. The Marchioness of Salisbury was once said to have observed that she believed the Whig pulse beat at least ten seconds slower to the minute than the Tory pulse. A slow pulse is generally associated with a considerable degree of *sang-froid* and coolness in action, and there could certainly have been no doubt of Lord Granville's orthodoxy in the Whig faith, if the pulse was to be the index. 'I first began to attend your Lordship professionally in August 1844,' Dr. Meryon wrote in 1878; 'your healthy pulse was then forty-eight, and I have never known it otherwise.'[2] It is not unlikely that if the certificate of Lord Derby's medical adviser could also be produced, it would still

[1] From a sketch written in 1891, the authorship of which I have not been able to identify.—E. F.

[2] Dr. Meryon to Lord Granville, May 20, 1878.

further illustrate the dictum just quoted, and afford some clue to the results of the encounters between the two leaders in the Lords, and explain why opponents ranking among the oratorical and intellectual leaders of the day had to acknowledge that, although Lord Granville made no pretence to eloquence, and although his elocution, compared especially with that of such giants of speech as Lord Derby, might be deemed imperfect, they frequently somehow came off second best in encounters with the adversary whom at first sight they had been disposed to underrate, and had occasion to realise that though his words were 'softer than honey,' yet were they 'drawn swords,' and that when he chose he could be a dispenser of the precious balms which are said to break the head. 'You should look out in debate,' Lord Wodehouse used to say, 'for Granville's "*last words*,"' for if Lord Granville was a master of the retort courteous, he could also on occasion put salt into his honey. The famous lines in which Lucretius describes the sting hidden beneath the flowers of life—

'Medio de fonte leporum
Surgit amari aliquid quod in ipsis floribus angat'—

might often on such occasions have suggested themselves to the well-read mind of Lord Derby as no inapt description of the peculiar acid which frequently was to be detected in what might be called the dedication of his opponent's speeches. The same quality was also sometimes to be found in the last words of his letters, coming with a sense of shock. An Ambassador once wrote home explaining very fully that the circumstances called for his own immediate resignation, and that he accordingly tendered it. A reply arrived in due course. But not a word at first could the Ambassador find in Lord Granville's letter about the resignation. Just as he was going to put the letter by, thinking it might have been an answer to an earlier communication, he observed a postscript. It ran as follows: 'One passage in your letter made my hair stand on end! Why do you amuse yourself by letting off fireworks at your friends?' No more was heard after this of the resignation.

It used to be said that the speeches of the Duke of Argyll and Mr. Gladstone made the audience think first of the argument, and afterwards of the form and style; but that those of Lord Granville suggested praise of the style and of the manner first, and of the argument afterwards; and that he was a connoisseur in politics and an epicure in speech.[1] Nevertheless it would be a mistake to underrate the power of argument in Lord Granville's speeches. The firm grasp especially which he possessed of sound economic doctrine, and of the principles on which the Free Trade policy of the country had been developed, not only enabled him at this time to be an effective interpreter of the ideas of Mr. Cobden to the Upper House, but also powerfully contributed to fit him to hold his own in debates where the mere superiority in eloquence of his antagonists was in consequence found to be counterbalanced by gifts which in this respect rose above theirs.[2] A narrow parochialism of view existed in regard to commercial questions on the Tory benches of the House of Lords. No statesman indeed probably ever occupied the post of Prime Minister who regarded such questions from so profoundly prejudiced a point of view as Lord Derby himself, who was also deficient in the personal knowledge of the Continent and of the statesmen of Europe in which Lord Granville excelled. To Lord Derby a debate on foreign affairs had no real interest or attraction except as affording an opportunity for party advantage. Lord Granville was then on a battle-field of his own choosing, and had a superiority which was felt by his audience, although Lord Hardwicke, who was a naval peer and addicted to the use of rugged language, declared him 'to be half a Frenchman, amiable, polite, and soft,' and his accomplishments to be such as a true Englishman might well be ashamed to possess, and still more to exhibit in public.[3]

Lord Granville, it was observed, 'had the quality of mitigating the asperity of party warfare,' a quality, in the words of

[1] *Pall Mall Gazette*, June 9, 1880.
[2] *Glasgow Herald*, April 1, 1891.
[3] Lord Granville to Lord Canning, May 25, 1856.

Sir Roundell Palmer, 'admirable and excellent at all times;'[1] yet he never shrank from expressing his opinions, or from doing so with an effect which everybody felt; for if urbanity and a sunshiny humour were his rule, there were occasions when he was quite able to take off the gloves and hit out straight from the shoulder, and to show that he possessed when necessary 'in a singular degree the gift of putting forward his own views without compromise, if never with any offence to those opposed to him.'[2] That the glove of velvet encased a fist of steel soon began to be recognised; a fact of which even some of his own friends had now and then been reminded, as, although a master of the arts of persuasion, Lord Granville knew also how to crack the party whip over the heads of his followers, and to crack it at times rather sharply. The Marquis of Ailesbury in every Liberal Ministry held one of the great Household appointments. A man of great personal charm, but of easy-going and unpunctual habits, he disliked even the scant claims made on his time by attendance in the House of Lords, and was frequently found to be at Savernake when expected to be at Westminster. Lord Granville, however, absolutely declined to stand such conduct even from so close a friend, and one morning the Marquis of Ailesbury found on his table a letter from his leader to the following effect:—

'Bessborough told me that you intended leaving London for a fortnight. I therefore asked him to remind you of what I had told you at the formation of the Government, viz. that I had accepted the lead on the express condition that members of the Household should constantly attend the House of Lords, unless when in attendance on the Queen, in the same way as the members of the Government.

'I am very sorry to hear from him that you were annoyed by the message, and expressed a readiness to attend, but not to give that *constant attendance* which is expected from an official peer. I believe my proposal to be of great importance, not only to the Government, but to the character of the House of Lords. The same rule was pretty well observed under Derby and Malmesbury; and I must endeavour to maintain it. You will see that I am at once check-

[1] *Hansard*, cccli. 468. [2] *Ibid.* cccli. 465.

mated if the first man in the Household, and my most intimate friend, in theory and in practice disregards it.'[1]

What the House of Lords dreaded most of all was, Lord Granville thought, being bored. He was fond of telling how a French nobleman was said to have been questioned every year by the Grand Monarque as to the health of his Countess, and the number of his sons and daughters. His customary answer was: 'Your Majesty, the Countess is, alas! no more. I have five children.' But one year, when the accustomed query from the royal lips once more came round at the annual reception, he murmured with a bow: 'Your Majesty, the Countess is in excellent health. We have seven children.' 'What!' said the indignant King; 'I think that you said only five last time, and that the Countess was dead.' 'True, your Majesty,' was the unabashed reply; 'but knowing your Majesty hated being bored, I dreaded a repetition of the same story which I had so frequently told your Majesty.' The delighted King raised the witty noble two steps in the peerage of France. The moral which adorned this tale was that the House of Lords in some ways resembled the Grand Monarque; that in addressing that fastidious assembly it was necessary to understand their little idiosyncrasies, and to remember that they preferred new illustrations of an old story to a constant repetition of the old story itself. But in regard to public audiences Lord Granville's opinion was different. He thought that they preferred an old and familiar joke to a new one. 'Have you not often seen,' he said, 'at a dull opera, the *prima donna* come forward and sing the "Last Rose of Summer" or some old familiar song? The whole house wakes up, beats time, nods to friends in the boxes, and enjoys it more than any new music.' Lord Plunket, the orator, had told him that he laid it down as an axiom always to make a pause before bringing out any phrase which he had particularly prepared, to give his hearers the idea that it was impromptu. He once told this anecdote to Mr. Disraeli. The reply was: 'Don't we always do it?' A good instance of this kind of oratorical effect was

[1] February 16, 1856.

the repetition on one occasion by him amid great applause of an old quip at the dinner of the Royal College of Physicians, when he inquired of his learned audience if in their long experience they really could say they had known a case of *cause following effect.* There were of course cries of dissent amid laughter. Then after a proper pause, 'Not even,' said Lord Granville, 'when the doctor follows his patient to the grave?'[1]

He, however, knew that the gift of telling anecdotes was one requiring to be most carefully adjusted to the audience. It was difficult, for example, in his opinion to tell what effect a joke or indeed 'any statement might have had upon twenty undemonstrative peers;'[2] and whether in the House of Lords or elsewhere the gift required to be carefully fitted to the surrounding circumstances, and above all never to be overdone or unduly drawn upon. He possibly remembered that Lord Chesterfield is said to have left 'the club' when he became aware in his later years that George Selwyn had spoken of him as 'Joe Miller' in the society that assembled there.

A large number of Egyptian officials, of every European nationality, who had come to London in connection with the negotiations relating to the finances of the State, were entertained at a dinner in Carlton House Terrace. When they had left, Lord Granville observed to his Under-Secretary: 'This has been a grand occasion for firing off the old anecdotes. You see, not one of them fortunately could possibly have heard them before, and I think I told them rather better than usual.' But such opportunities, it had to be remembered, were rare, and it was owing to the consciousness of danger under less exceptional circumstances that, in jotting down the anecdotes relating to the Duke of Wellington already quoted, and a few others to be found in the earlier part of this volume, Lord Granville prefaced them with this warning to all and several who might be tempted to follow his example:—

[1] *Recollections by Sir Algernon West*, i. 236, ii. 163.
[2] Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone, May 6, 1854.

'Prosper Mérimée said that the only thing in history which interested him were its anecdotes—an opinion which would be fatal to the success of many of our best historians. But as I have none of the qualifications of these writers, and have accumulated a large number of stories during a long life, some portion of which has been passed in the society of remarkable men of my own and foreign countries, it may amuse my children if I put into writing a few anecdotes as they occur to me. I, however, warn them that I am placing in their hands that which if aptly applied may enliven a book, a letter, a discourse, or a conversation, but which may also become a fearful instrument of torture to mankind.'

CHAPTER X

THE INDIAN MUTINY

APRIL 9, 1857, TO MARCH 1858

THE last of the letters from Lord Granville to Lord Canning in the previous chapter left him exclusively occupied with the ill-will of Russia, the chances of trouble in Italy, the vacillating policy of the Emperor of the French, and the rivalries of Lord John Russell and Lord Palmerston. The letters of Lord Canning, if indicating more than one source of possible peril in regard to Indian affairs, have shown the Governor-General more apprehensive of serious trouble from an unwise frontier policy and the troubles with Persia than from any other quarter. But in January 1857 signs of a mutinous spirit among the Native soldiers of the Indian Army began to manifest themselves. Desertion on a large scale set in at the same time. In March several regiments had to be disbanded. In April a sepoy and a Native lieutenant were executed as an example; and by these capital sentences, and some milder punishments in other cases, it was hoped that the movement had been terminated. But these hopes were doomed to disappointment, and on the movement at Barrackpore there rapidly followed the grim series of events known under the comprehensive title of 'the Indian Mutiny:' events fraught with terrible and glorious memories of danger and endurance. Of these events some record will be found in the following pages, in which Lord Canning is his own biographer, while Lord Granville chronicles the contemporary events of English public life in their bearing on the position of his absent friend, thus suddenly placed on the pinnacle of danger in the hour of national peril, and

exposed to the full blast of an irresponsible and ignorant criticism. Some letters also will be found by another pen, written at moments when the exhaustion of work and anxiety had caused the Governor-General's pen to drop from his hand: letters which will not detract from the reputation already enshrined in the pages which commemorate the *Two Noble Lives* of Lady Waterford and Lady Canning.

LORD CANNING TO LORD GRANVILLE.

CALCUTTA, *April* 9, 1857.

'MY DEAR GRANVILLE,—I have made a small vow never to miss a post, even if it be only a blank cover. I wonder how this will answer. The Diary system is more than I can manage, especially when the evenings find one so dead beat as is now coming to be the case. In another month we shall be at our hottest, or nearly.

'I have had a very *mauvais quart d'heure* since my last letter—and a very long one—in the matter of the Mutiny; but it is all well over, so far as danger goes; although troubles enough will spring out of it. It has been a much more anxious matter than Persia, ten times over; for a false step might have set the Bengal Army in a blaze. As it is, I am rather pleased with the way in which it has been dealt with. Do not whisper it, but, to say the truth, I have been glad to have the Commander-in-Chief up in the far North-West. He has plenty of pluck and plenty of coolness; but I doubt his judgment as to when and what to yield. He would have given way on a matter respecting using the cartridges at Umballa, which would have stultified everything which was done here at Barrackpore and in Bengal, and would have made it infinitely difficult to take up sound ground afterwards. The question, too, is not one of army discipline alone. It would easily have been swelled into one affecting the faith of the great mass of the community, and unless the true ground of insisting that no injury was being done to that faith, and that therefore the army without exception *must* obey, and that immediately, had been held, we should have had not the sepoys alone, but all India jumping to the conclusion that we *had* been trying to ensnare them into a loss of caste, and had been foiled in the attempt.

'They are curious creatures these sepoys—just like children. *Ombrageux* is the word for them, I think. Shadows and their own fancies seem to frighten them much more than realities.

'Lieutenant-Colonel of the 34th (Wheeler). His whole mind is given to religious teaching, in pursuing which he professes (quite truly, no doubt) to keep clear of the cantonments and regimental

bazaars, but to follow his object zealously in all other places and amongst all classes, not excluding sepoys. Rumours to this effect reached me a week ago, and an inquiry was addressed to himself directly upon it. His answer was a curious one, half honest and earnest, and half finessing and quibbling; whatever may be its bearing in other respects.'

April 23, 1857.

'My dear K.G.,—One line just to keep my vow.

'I wish you joy with all my heart. It sounds very flat to say, "I thought so," but I really did.

'Mrs. A. exaggerates about work. And now that Persia is over, I am inspirited with the certainty of getting away after the heats—it is too late to escape from them.

'The mutinies may still go on giving trouble, but all the heavy work—disbanding and hanging—is over, or very nearly so, I hope.

'It has been a really anxious time—such as I hope not to come upon again—and it has about doubled my work lately.

'I almost repent what (I believe) I wrote to you last about the Commander-in-Chief.'

May 4, 1857.

'It will be very little better than an envelope this time.

'I do not consider you justified in giving up the Diary system. Whilst Parliament sits you might keep a box in the robing room, with a sheet always ready to be gone on with when R. or A. gets up (unless it is about India). As it is, I have had another blank mail.

'I wonder whether it is from being out of political talk for so long; but it seems as if there had never been bitterness equal to what I have seen in late speeches—to say nothing of Tamarang's letter. I did not think Pam discreet at the Mansion House.

'I am very sorry for Gladstone. I suppose the China speech was a very violent exhibition from all that has been written to us about it; but it would not have had that appearance to me reading it.

'I thought your speech very good indeed. I should not like to have had to make it. The subject would not have been *simpatico*. I think we (England) were wrong about the lorcha, and right about the entrance to Canton, but that Bowring's presumption in swelling the small case into the great one on his own hook was indefensible. I quite think that there was nothing to be done but to uphold him—or rather the war—and that makes the awkwardness of the question.

'The mutinies are smouldering, but going out, I think and pray. It is the worst kind of anxiety I have had to do with.'

CALCUTTA, *May* 19, 1857.

'MY DEAR GRANVILLE,—Rather more than a year ago you answered a remark of mine—which had been provoked by the sight of poor Sir H. Pottinger at Malta—by saying that perhaps great disasters *would* take place in India in my time. Things look as if you might prove a true prophet. The most formidable of all disasters is looming close ahead—the defection of the Native army.

'I told you, I think, in my last letter that the mutinies were disposed of; and so far as the demeanour of the regiments hereabouts, where disaffection was supposed to be most rife, is concerned, this is still true. The bad spirits are cowed and submissive, and since March 31—the day of the example of the 19th Regiment—have shown no disposition to give trouble. But if such scenes as during the last ten days have been enacted up in the North-West Provinces are repeated, I cannot say where mutiny will stop, or where it will not burst out. The events, though not yet fully known, are horrible. At Meerut, the headquarters of a division, 40 miles from Delhi and 900 from Calcutta, a station strong in Europeans (having the Carbineers, 60th Rifles, and a large artillery force), a Native cavalry regiment which had got into disgrace about the cartridges led the way by rescuing some men of the corps from gaol.[1] The Native infantry regiments (two in number) joined. Officers were shot down, civilians, women and children, murdered, and the great body of the mutineers escaped to Delhi, where the three Native regiments of the garrison (there are no Europeans there) joined them, and together seized the town, repeating the atrocities of Meerut. They still hold it, and have pretended to elect a son of the old pensioned King as their ruler. It was certainly a desperate *coup*, if premeditated; but they have put themselves into a trap from which there *ought* to be no escape for them. The European regiments are coming down from the hills—the irregulars are closing round upon them—the cavalry of the Native chiefs (Scindia and Bhurtpore) are guarding the roads, and if all is quickly done the example will be a terrible one. But time is everything. These outbursts are catching. If Delhi and its ruffians are not sharply disposed of, I shall be very anxious for other parts of the country. The real dangers are not in the North-West Provinces, with European troops more or less within reach, but elsewhere and wider. Look at a map. At Calcutta I have at this moment two European regiments (but only by dint of having taken one away from Pegu six weeks ago for the first operations against the mutineers). After that the nearest European corps is at Patna, more than thirty marches from Calcutta, and at least five

[1] May 11, 12, 1857.

days from Benares, the headquarters of Hindoo bigotry, and yet garrisoned by natives alone, although a wealthy and very populous city. Right and left of the line along which I am taking you, we have no English troops nearer than Bombay on the west and Hong Kong on the east. At Allahabad (just above Benares), the fortress and arsenal of those parts, we have not a single European soldier, although it contains State prisoners and a treasury. I have just sent 100 bold invalids there, being the only white men within reach. At Cawnpore, a great military cantonment, we have three companies of a Queen's regiment, of which the headquarters are at Lucknow. Then come Delhi and Meerut. At the former, the chief seat of Mussulman influence, and containing an important arsenal, we have no Europeans. At Meerut we have them, and why they have failed to keep down the rising of last week remains to be seen, but this does not diminish their value in my eyes. Further, north-westwards, in the Punjab, it is different. That is the province in which our chief European force has been concentrated, and for a time, in the south of the province, very widely. But we have younger provinces now, and although they do not require such close watching as the Punjab did, they drain our army more or less, and we have been blind and stupid to go on annexing Pegu, Nagpore, and Oude without adding a single English soldier to our strength. Indeed, we are weaker by two regiments than we were before the Russian War. Well along the line, right and left of it, which I have described, although there are no European regiments, there is no lack of Native ones, who have it all their own way. *If* this disaffection should spread and burst out into such violence as has been exhibited at Meerut and Delhi, you may imagine the plunder, slaughter, consternation, and ruin which would ensue. The flame would spread without a check straight on end for 700 or 800 miles, over the richest tracts in India. And, literally, I could not under many weeks collect a force at any one spot on that line which should be strong enough to give any confidence to Europeans—to say nothing of reparation of losses, which would be impossible. Whether the infection of mutiny will spread or not, no mortal man can say. None are more surprised at what has happened at Meerut than those who know the sepoys best; and I have lost *entirely* all confidence in the commanding officers of regiments, who with scarcely an exception swear to the fidelity of their men, and when a scoundrel is caught in the act have nothing to say but "Who'd have thought it?" Anyhow it would be criminal to leave a single measure untried by which our present weakness can be strengthened during the next few weeks, and to this I have been bending all my energies. First and foremost

I have sent an officer to Ceylon, where I hope and believe he will meet Elgin and Ashburnham, to persuade Elgin to give me the China regiments for a time. It cannot matter whether Yeh is cornered now or six months hence. Canton will keep—India will not. I have written strongly to Elgin, privately and formally. He ought not to refuse. I have also entreated Sir H. Ward to send me at least half of his Queen's regiment from Ceylon.[1] The regiments for Persia are all on their way from Bushire, and will be pushed on here, by steam, without a moment's halt. Another regiment has been taken from Madras, and another from Pegu, which must, as soon as I have a steamer to send, yield up a third. In short, if the China regiments can be caught, the force will be an imposing one, and equal to anything that can be required of it; but no human exertion can remove the delays and consequent dangers of the intervening stretch of country between Calcutta and the weak places further north which I have mentioned. European troops cannot be moved over the ground otherwise than slowly, although all the post-horse and bullock-cart establishments have been retained for Government use, and detachments of the 84th are now moving up like gentlemen in the postchaises of the country.

'I have no time for more. The time is critical, and no man can see his way clear to the end of these troubles, but I feel in good heart; and it is a real pleasure to work with such noble-hearted fellows as Henry Lawrence, Colvin, and John Lawrence. I bless the day when I put the first into Oude, not two months ago, and against many hints and carpings. Colvin is the only one of the three I don't know personally. He was in bad odour as Lord Auckland's right-hand man in the Afghan War; but he has amply redeemed his errors, if they were his. Cool, firm, without any brag, and with excellent judgment.'

Lord Granville to Lord Canning.

London, *June* 10, 1857

'My dear Canning,—I have only time to give a sign of life. You will see by to-day's *Times* that Ellenborough made a little onslaught upon you yesterday. He had given me notice of his question, but none of his attack upon you. I was very angry, and had not time to arrange my thoughts, but I spat it out, and was never better received by the House. It would have flattered you to see the excitement on our side of the House. Old Aberdeen grunted, and Lord Lansdowne, who spoke, was in a frenzy. Ellenborough looked ashamed; was very angry, but disclaimed, I believe with truth, having

[1] Sir Henry Ward was Governor of Ceylon.

intended an attack upon you. You may as well let me know how the case stands.[1]

'Vernon Smith has been repeating news to the Cabinet from all quarters, all tending to glorify you for your late conduct. The political calm here continues. Palmerston is as nearly a dictator in the House of Commons. He is beginning to fade a little in looks.

'Poor Lady Jocelyn looks ill and coughs. Lady Pam is showing symptoms of age. Morpeth thought all the Cabinet did, excepting Argyll and me.

'I asked Derby yesterday to pair with me for the Cup Day. He assented, but said it was foolish of me to pair with one of my best supporters. Lord Lyndhurst has been speaking better and stronger than ever. Odd as it may be, I never knew the House of Lords better attended, or more alive to business.'

LORD CANNING TO LORD GRANVILLE.

CALCUTTA, *June* 20, 1857.

'MY DEAR GRANVILLE,—I wonder whether you understood my unexplained inclosure sent by the last mail? Perhaps if Vernon Smith showed you my letter, or the official papers, you will have guessed that my object was to be defended by you in the event of anyone in the House of Lords attacking me for Colvin's Proclamation offering free pardon to the foulest murderers. But post time found me with not more than time to stuff the papers into a cover and direct it.

'As things are now going I am afraid you may have a troublesome time in defending me; but I do not ask you to take any trouble about any attack that may be made, unless it be in regard to that Proclamation.[2] I should feel keenly if that were supposed at home, as by some here it was supposed, to be my act, and I have never made a greater sacrifice than in allowing it to pass without a public cancelling of it.

'I don't care what they say about the control assumed over the press—for my tendencies I believe are anything but despotic on that head, and yet I never felt more sure that I had done the right thing than in passing that law. If you think of saying anything in my behalf upon it, pray read the latter part of my letter to Vernon Smith, especially a few lines about the *Hushara* newspaper as an

[1] The first intelligence of an outbreak in India reached this country early in June. On the 9th of that month Lord Ellenborough called attention to Indian affairs in the House of Lords.

[2] This is the Proclamation of Mr. Colvin's referred to at greater length at p. 256.

example of the perilous mischief which they scatter about; and, for generalities on the press in India, buy *The Life of Sir T. Munro* (in Murray's Colonial Library) and turn to his minute in Chapter XV. Perhaps, however, you won't agree. In that case don't turn upon me. The shutting up of the King of Oude is a strong measure, but probably will pass without much cavil, if you are all as frightened about India as people here expect you to be.

'It has been—and is still—a perilous time; but I am in good heart, and never was in better health in my life.

'I have not another minute. Good-bye, my dear G.'

Lord Granville to Lord Canning.

House of Lords, *July* 10, 1857.

'I have just finished a flat sensible speech on moving the second reading of the Jew Bill.[1] Derby is now speaking, and does not seem inclined to say much that is new. I should have wished to write you a long letter in this most interesting conjuncture. Some of your friends are low about you. I think the moment is a serious one, that it may involve very painful duties on you, but I believe that the insurrection will be suppressed, that you will reorganise the Bengal Army, that you will see reason to rejoice that the mischief occurred at this moment, and that you will gain infinite credit for your firmness, moderation, and judgment. The Cabinet is in the best possible frame of mind about you; they have full confidence in you, and I believe will thoroughly support you both as regards your administrative acts and in Parliament. Ellenborough has not lately been in a good humour. He attacked you about subscriptions to missionary societies, which you will see I answered as well as I can.[2] He rather declined hearing my explanations about what you have done. I do not think he means to be unfriendly, but he gets excited, and feels a jealousy of all those who stand in his old shoes. He pours in all sorts of letters and information. We discussed in the Cabinet before your letters came the expediency of our stopping the Chinese troops. Some were for it, but Pam objected. Nothing was said after you had announced that you had done so. All that I spoke to, approved. I told Vernon Smith so. I thought he ought to send an official approvement. He went to Pam for authority; I have not heard the result.

'It is well that you should send me every proof that you do not give in to proselytising, though nobody believed Ellenborough's

[1] The Bill to alter the oaths taken by members of Parliament, popularly known as the 'Jew' Bill.

[2] This charge was made in the above-mentioned debate.

charge. Excuse this stupid letter, and in all this bother take care of your health.'

LONDON, *July* 12, 1857.

'I take advantage of Sir Colin's departure and his intention to catch the last mail, to add one line to the scrawl of Wednesday.[1] We have received the melancholy news of poor George Anson's death. Poor Mrs. Anson is quite stunned. She gave a fearful shriek when the news was brought to her. I am afraid that, in addition to the blow, she and her daughters will be badly off. The *Telegraph* tells us that the Mutiny has been spreading in Bengal, that 30,000 Natives have disappeared from the army, that the English troops have had a great success before Delhi. If this is the case, I hope the whole thing will be speedily put down. I agree with your sister that Charles Wood ought to have said more in the House about your having done right in asking for the Chinese troops.[2] There was no difference yesterday as to stopping those troops which could be caught. I wanted the 1,400 which it is supposed will have arrived at Hongkong, should also be sent back, but Pam would not hear of it, and perhaps is right. I do not hear a word of doubt about you, which in the present serious state of things is satisfactory. We shall be anxious to receive the next mail, but I presume there will not be much information in the letters.'

LORD CANNING TO LORD GRANVILLE.

CALCUTTA, *July* 20, 1857.

'MY DEAR GRANVILLE,—A thousand thanks for your gallant and admirably judged defence of me against Ellenborough. Another letter tells you all that I have done which in any way connects itself with missionaries. Use it at your discretion, if the matter should come to life again.

'Things are not materially mending. Barnard was still before Delhi on the 1st, since which nothing but vague bazaar rumours have been received, bringing no important news.[3] If the reinforcements which he will have received from the Punjab within the first week of the month have not enabled him to take the city, I see no chance of his doing so until other reinforcements shall reach him from here; and with the many points which have to be guarded, or relieved,

[1] Sir Colin Campbell had been appointed Commander-in-Chief in India in succession to General Anson, who died before Delhi, May 27, 1857.

[2] Lord Canning wisely detained the troops on their way to China for service in India.

[3] General Anson was succeeded by Sir Henry Barnard.

between this and Delhi, it will be long before we shall have troops enough at this end of the country to allow of any being pushed up so far. The length of time will depend mainly upon my being able to extract more than two regiments from Elgin. He did not leave orders at Singapore for more than the first two to turn this way, and the second of these came into the river yesterday. I am pressing him for more.

'There has been a dreadful horror at Cawnpore. That fiend of a Mahratta, the Rajah of Bithoor (or the Nana, as you will generally see him called), after murdering General Wheeler and the garrison as soon as they had capitulated, kept some of the women and children (about thirty, it is supposed) in confinement. Havelock's column marched upon him five days ago, and before the engagement began the Nana massacred every one of his captives. It is sickening to think of these things, and to feel retribution delayed; but in the present instance it is possible that the reckoning may be short, for Havelock has pursued the monster to his own stronghold, after driving him out of Cawnpore; and although he has made it very strong, and is said to have 7,000 black traitors and heavy guns against our 1,400 Englishmen with field pieces, I am sanguine of the result. The venture must be tried; for Lucknow cannot be relieved until the villain is disposed of.

'Poor Henry Lawrence is dead. Wounded on the 2nd, and died on the 4th. It is a terrible loss, and a very depressing one. I had not more than a week's personal acquaintance with him last year; but I felt quite an affection for him. He was such a gentleman—so generous and chivalrous, and had done his duty so nobly in Oude.[1]

'I ask for more troops by this mail—about 15,000 more. If the Queen's army cannot spare them, I hope some power and facility for raising men will be given to the East India Company. A few militia companies put together would make very effective regiments for purposes here.'

Lord Granville to Lord Canning.

London, *July* 25, 1857.

'The greatest panic exists in London about the next Indian news; why, I cannot tell. Some seem to think that news has been mysteriously received; others say that the best authorities all agree that the siege of Delhi must be a long and serious affair. Sir Charles Trevelyan is able to state the exact sums which were spent on the fortifications of that great city. I, as usual, am foolishly sanguine. I feel that I have been wanting to you in

[1] Sir Henry Lawrence died July 4, 1857.

supplying you with daily information. Lady Clanricarde is furious with the *Daily News* for the attacks upon you.[1] She was very angry, and justly, with Charles Wood's answer in the House of Commons about your stopping the troops destined to China. It appears that Palmerston, who was to have made the answer, was not present. Charley Wood with his usual alacrity would not let Vernon Smith get up, but volunteered an answer. When on his legs he found he knew nothing about it. As I thought it possible that you might think this answer odd, I asked Clarendon to telegraph to Sir Colin Campbell at Marseilles, to tell him to inform you that your conduct had been fully approved by her Majesty's Government in both Houses of Parliament. I took care to say in the Lords that I did so as the official organ of the Government. You need not (indeed it is not likely that you will) mind the *Daily News*. Public opinion here is entirely in your favour. Delane told Clarendon that all his accounts said that you had risen equal to the emergency, and had won golden opinions in India. Bob Lowe has the same information. Dr. Duff writes to Panmure in the most eulogistic strain. It is possible that we may hear a different account of you, if there is any want of success in India; but I take all chances, and feel sure that your reputation will be immensely increased. Clarendon read your despatch to Elgin, to the Cabinet, pronouncing it to be admirable. We are to have an Indian Debate on Monday. Ellenborough is not unfavourable to you, but his vanity makes him say things which he does not mean. He wishes to have an Act of Parliament passed immediately giving you power to appoint an extra Member of Council (he means Grant), and enabling you to leave Calcutta without the permission of your Council. Public opinion is strong against poor Anson.[2] What is your opinion? Poor Mrs. Anson has been much stunned. I hear from Lady Newport that she was truly grateful to you for your letter and its inclosures. Lady Lichfield has asked me to suggest to you to make her son extra aide-de-camp. I believe he acted in that capacity to the poor General.

'There is one opinion of yours to which we do not quite bow, viz. as to the increase of the Company's European forces. Everybody here is in favour of a permanent increase of Queen's troops; the Court, the Horse Guards, the War Office, the House of Lords.

[1] Lady Clanricarde was Lord Canning's sister.

[2] Public opinion, unprepared for the disasters in India, had as usual looked round to find a victim whom it could make responsible for events which were only part of a long chain of circumstances. The first Lord Malmesbury said after the battle of Jena: 'The Duke of Brunswick *being dead* is of course said to be the planner of that battle and the cause of its loss.' (*Memoirs*, iv. 365.) The same observation applies in the case of General Anson.

The Directors' opinion the other way is supposed to be influenced by views of patronage. Your arguments seem to be the danger of the Government at home diverting, in the case of a European war, troops required for the safety of India, and the importance of absorbing the Company's officers, now set loose by the disappearance of the sepoy soldiers. At the last Cabinet I implored the Cabinet not to postpone the consideration of the question, that it ought to be maturely considered, and then a decision made; if in favour of Queen's troops, it would be necessary to consider how you are to get rid of the enormous expense of your officers. They might either be taken by the Horse Guards, or they might possibly be absorbed by the Civil Service. Vernon Smith is not quite the man I should wish to see in his present office, but I should think infinitely superior to Mars. (The Harcourts say that Miss Madeleine Smith, the poisoner, is going to change her name to Vernon.) I hope that you will not go too fast in the abandonment of the sepoy system. As far as I can make out, their misconduct is much owing to our prolonged mismanagement of the Bengal Army; with officers too few, talking of their soldiers as "cursed blackamoors," as they did to Freddy; with great ignorance of the language, too much restriction on the commanding officers, both as regards reward and punishment; all the best officers taken away for civil service; and some foolish meddling with religious feelings. You will have to reorganise this army, and you ought to have a greater permanent force of Europeans, but you must depend on natives for a large portion of your force.

'Pam, who is in the room, begs to be remembered, thanks you for all you have done, and hopes you will continue with the same vigour. He desires me to say that if the news comes blacker, we shall send you out more troops, and shall take vigorous measures to replace them at home.

'I had a fall from my horse, who put his leg into a drain yesterday at the farm, but luckily fell on a stout part of my person. My best love to Lady Canning, with every wish for your success and prosperity.'

LONDON, *August* 10, 1857.

'The one great topic in London is India, and I fancied that I had volumes to write to you on the subject; but I am not sure that I have enough to fill this sheet. We are anxiously expecting news of the capture of Delhi. It is evident from your letters that you think it of paramount importance that the capture should be speedy, and you seem sanguine that this will be the case. Military authorities here shake their heads. Windham among others says it cannot be

taken till the end of October (this, however, makes Craven believe that Delhi must be already taken).[1] We are ready to pour troops in as fast as your requisitions come. Mars is more pompous than ever. Vernon Smith seems sensible, but I perceive that Melville of the India House has a contempt for him. And now as regards yourself: public opinion is strongly in your favour. I have consulted people such as Somerset and others. They all agree that it is extraordinary that it should be unanimously favourable. I never knew Ellenborough so completely alone in the House. On the last occasion, Argyll and I were cheered to the echo. I get much abused for being too civil to him, but I am sure it is right. He is perpetually writing to me, sending me letters from Durand and others.[2] Durand appears to be a clever *frondeur*. Ellenborough comes back to meet the next mail. One thing in which we do not like your advice is the increasing of the European troops belonging to the India Company. The Court have sent a very feeble memorandum on the subject. All authorities seem to agree that the Queen's troops after being acclimatised are better. The principal objections seem to be the financial one, the difficulty of absorbing your officers, and secondly, the probability of denuding India when troops are wanted nearer home. Cannot you and the *Horse Guards* absorb the officers, and could not an Act of Parliament be passed, or some other security taken, that a reduction of troops could not take place in India, without taking certain steps which would insure deliberation? I suggest this, but I think the argument is weak on your side. You must trust your Government at home. If that Government is not to be trusted, you are still helpless. If you insisted upon having a Company's army sufficient to defend India, you would be logical; but you have an army which requires to be supplemented by Queen's troops, and on that margin the Home Government may encroach, and the having more or less India Company's troops does not save you.

'Your, or rather Lady Canning's, fears of unpopularity for bullying the press have proved utterly groundless. Everybody is enchanted, and even the newspapers themselves seem to approve, although *si va di loro decoro* to give a subdued grunt. Colvin's proclamation has not created a sensation here, probably because it is known that you disapproved of it.[3] If successful, you will have a difficult matter *in re* punishment. You must be firm, but it strikes us that your Anglo-Indians are maddened, and ready to inflict a vengeance which might

[1] General Windham, the 'hero of the Redan.'

[2] Sir Henry Durand, K.C.S.I.

[3] Martial law was proclaimed in the North-West Provinces of India by the Lieutenant-Governor, Mr. Colvin, in May, but it was considered that he had accompanied it with too extensive offers of pardon to those who surrendered.

be disgraceful to us, and not even politic. You are sure to be right in that, but the question of degree is a nice one. Have you ascertained what are the feelings of the disbanded troops; are they contented, angry or sorrowful? This is an important element in considering the reorganising of the Bengal Army.

'Do not be chary in stating your wishes. The Government are most anxious to know what you think and what you require. Clarendon read out your letter to Elgin as the model of a despatch. Your last private letter to Vernon Smith was thought admirable by the Cabinet. Dalhousie is unwell in health, vigorous as ever in mind; going to Malta, taking no part, and suggesting nothing unless questioned; is not an alarmist, approves of what has been done; thinks military possession must be taken of India in the first instance, but thinks permanent reorganisation of the Indian Army ought not to be decided upon in a hurry. He holds the same language as you about the financial difficulty of having nothing European but Queen's troops.

'God bless you. Ch. Greville, when he was told that B. Baring was made ill by the cares of his inheritance, said that to inherit 40,000*l.* a year was just what his health required. I believe your mind and body will both be better for this great crisis. I am sure with ordinary luck your reputation will gain immensely. Give my best love to Lady Canning. What a comfort to have so sensible and so courageous a partner in such a time. You may imagine how interested your friends are in all that now concerns you. Lady Sydney and I become personages, in consequence of your letters.'

LONDON, *August* 26, 1857.

'Odd as it may appear to you, I do not think I have much to say. It is impossible that you should care much about anything in England excepting what is thought of India. There is in this respect nothing new. We have been a little disheartened by a vague telegraph from Alexandria which announces the deaths of Sir H. Lawrence and of Sir Henry Barnard.[1] I presume that Lawrence is a very great loss; the real thing which alarms us all is hearing nothing of the capture of Delhi, and we are not sure whether in your requisitions for troops you do not look upon Delhi as taken. Ellenborough comes up to town for each mail. He takes a gloomy view of affairs, but his tone about you appears to be changed. The confidence felt by the Cabinet in particular, and by the public in general, is as great as you could wish and more than you could

[1] General Reid succeeded to the command before Delhi on the death of Sir Henry Barnard from cholera on July 5, 1857, but retired on the 25th, when the command was taken by Sir Archdale Wilson.

expect. I am sure that anything you do will be approved; and do not be deterred by any irregularity in point of form from making whatever appears to you the best use of yourself, of Sir Patrick Grant, or of anybody or anything else.

'I must tell you that in the opinion of Ellenborough, of Sir George Clerk, and others, you would do well to get away from your Council and Calcutta, and go up (whenever it is perfectly safe to do so, a paramount consideration for a person in your position) to some place near the scene of action. I tell you these opinions more readily, as they may tend to make you do that which may also be useful for your health. I hope you saw Jemmy Graham expressed his belief that what a Clive had won and a Wellesley maintained, a Canning would not lose. I can hardly believe that you have been gone nearly two years. How right you were to go, although Aberdeen underestimated the vitality of Pam's administration. He, Pam, is younger and healthier than when you last saw him. His very laborious work in the House has positively done him good. He complimented the House on their admirable qualities, so much so that an inference is drawn that in his opinion so perfect an institution cannot require much alteration.

'We have done pretty well in the House of Lords, where there is no great object for any peer to be troublesome, when they are convinced that the Government is safe for a time. I miss your friendly criticisms very much. The *Times* and a large portion of the party wish Johnny to be made a peer. It would be a good thing for everybody but himself, and he is too sagacious to accept being more or less shelved. There is a great opening for him as soon as Pam breaks down. Gladstone has shown immense ability in the discussions on the Divorce Bill; but as usual has done himself more harm than good. Your Mutiny has come inopportunely for him after his denunciations of the enormous expense of the establishment proposed this year by the Government. Sidney Herbert has not been very well, and has not taken much part since the general election. Lord Lansdowne is not going to be a Duke, as the papers announce. He is looking ill. I doubt your seeing him again.

'Windham goes out, very much impressed with the notion that we have not sent half troops enough.'

JERVAULX ABBEY, *September* 9, 1857.

'I left London last Tuesday, and came here *viâ* Staffordshire. They send you and Lady Canning all sorts of messages. The sort of life we lead here reminds me of the pleasant journey we made in Scotland a few years ago. I am on my way to Balmoral, where I am due on Saturday next. I have never heard them (the Queen and

Prince Consort) talk about India. I shall be curious to hear his views, and I will let you know them. When I left London, everybody continued to approve extremely of all that they knew that you have done. I really wish you joy. I have written by this mail to tell Elphy that we think his letters very good.[1] I fear I may have misled you in one of my letters. I forget exactly what I said, but I urged you to select the right line as between punishment and cruelty. I must tell you that the humanitarians are very few in number, and that people are gone rabid with desire of indiscriminate vengeance. I had a long letter from Ellenborough in which he says that he approves of the husbands who shot their wives and children in order to prevent their being violated; that the punishment inflicted not only on those who committed rapes, but on all who witnessed such proceedings, must be novel and extraordinary, that the criminals ought to be made objects of disgust for ever, &c. &c. . . .

'Clarendon is in a state of great alarm. He writes that Pam believes all he wishes; and therefore believes all that Panmure tells him about having a reserve; that he is sure we shall have a great disaster, that he undergoes such lectures from the Prince and the Queen about second battalions and extra companies, that his head is in a terrible confusion about the subject of recruiting.'

BALMORAL, *September* 24, 1857.

'My stay here has been pleasant. The weather fine, the place improved with some exceptions; the hosts more good-natured even than usual. Phipps and Grey, with two cheerful ladies, Lady Churchill and Flora Macdonald. I have had great sport two days with Farquharson and with Lord Fife, but missed every shot. The visitors have been the old Duchess of Gordon, Lord Aberdeen and his pleasing daughter-in-law. Panmure and Ben Stanley for a morning, Charles Greville for ditto and a night. The last three for a Council held to ordain a Fast Day with respect to you. Lord Aberdeen very piano, but probably affected by the disappearance of the old house. He takes rather a sanguine view of the results in India, and approves of you and your doings. He thinks Newcastle much annoyed at not having had the offer made to him, and believes, although he denies it, that he would have accepted. He thinks his temper and his suspiciousness a dreadful drawback to his use. He thinks he means to continue to act apart from any political connection. He says that Cardwell has decidedly embraced the Liberal side (Lord John), and is ready to go as far as may be required. He doubts the expediency of doing away with the East India Company,

[1] Lord Elphinstone was Governor of Bombay; Lord Harris, Governor of Madras.

but thinks it will be difficult to avoid it. I see Pam wishes to undertake it, perhaps as a counter-irritant to Reform. This latter question is said to occupy Lord John much; but it will be an enormous difficulty for everybody next session, with the public opinion entirely engrossed by you and your affairs. I think them here very sensible about India. They evidently lean towards destruction of the Company, and the Queen's name being universally used. The Prince thinks that there ought to be some solemn act by which she would assume to herself any title, such as the Great Mogul, which would connect itself with the ancient history of the country. They take what appears to me to be the sensible view of the punishments: great severity for the real culprits; transportation where death is not required; great care to spare the innocent, women and children, &c. &c., and are against any Vandal destruction of towns, palaces, &c. &c. I rather doubt whether the latter view, which appears to be the right one, is general. I believe Vernon Smith wrote to you by the last mail about officers divulging official details to Ellenborough. There is no doubt about its being wrong, but it is impossible to prevent; and Ellenborough himself makes the fairest use of his information, by condensing it, and often sending copies of the letters which he receives to me. I have told him that I always circulate them among my colleagues, and I encourage the correspondence by commonplace uncommitting acknowledgments. Clarendon and others thought (I think judiciously) that it was wise to keep up this correspondence with a man who is clever, has great knowledge, and who thinks of nothing but India. He may have ideas worth listening to, and he commits himself. If this letter is not too late, I hope you will be cautious in acting upon Vernon Smith's hints, proceeding from information supplied to us by Ellenborough himself. Ellenborough's criticisms are now almost all military. He hears that Patrick Grant has lost his head: is this true?[1] He believes that concentration is the great thing. What do you think of Sir Colin now you have him? Have you any intelligent man about you, who would every fortnight draw up for you a statement of the Calcutta accusations against you, and the short answer. It may be of use if you forward such a paper to me; such as "that you have delayed the disarmament of the Dinapore regiments too long; that you ought not to trust yourself even to an unarmed bodyguard; that you throw cold water upon the Calcutta volunteers." I mention these things as plums picked out of some of the hostile newspaper correspondence. I can guess the

[1] General Sir Patrick Hope-Grant was at this time the object of much ill-informed criticism in England.

answers to all, but still the real thing would be an advantage to me. You ought to have somebody about you capable of finding out what is the accusation likely to be sent home every mail.

'The Prince and the Queen have full confidence in you, and approve of what you do, which is lucky, for they are far from judging in the same way the conduct of the Home Government. Cupid is rather out of favour; Mars and the Spider objects of great indignation. They think that we shall not have reserves enough for your army, and no force left at home. They are both, as they well may be, delighted with an admirable letter from Lady Canning, which came by the last mail. Let me know confidentially what you think of the Court of Directors, and of the *Lord* who presides over the Board of Control. Macaulay's peerage was the result of my teasing for two years. It has been a hit. The others are calling me for an expedition up Lochnagar.'

LONDON, *October* 24, 1857.

'I do not know whether to continue my habit of writing to you, or whether I should write directly to Lady Canning to thank her for her admirable letter to me. I could not resist reading the greater part of it to the Cabinet, who were delighted with it. Pam paid her ladyship a compliment at the expense of her sex. "Ah, ah, a capital letter, unlike a lady's letter; it is all to the point, ah, ah." You will see that the press here took the same view of your Proclamation as the Calcutta public. I never liked any document so much. I would have gone to India and back, and considered that I had done my duty gloriously by the simple penning of and issuing it.[1] I was so angry with the *Times*, that I began a letter for publication, but on reflection I thought better of it. I believe that Delane is out of town, and that it is Dasent. I wrote privately to Delane, remonstrating, for the first time in my life, on the extreme folly and nonsense of the attack. I have had no answer. There is no doubt that, writing a week ago, I should have been obliged to tell you that public feeling was almost entirely in favour of the press on this point. I am happy to say that this is no longer the case, although a cruel sentiment in a speech would be more sure to be applauded than a humane one at this moment. If the approval of the Proclamation was not to be found, as I find it amongst all sensible people, I should still envy you your own feelings on the subject, and the certain *kudos* which you will gain by it from posterity. After all,

[1] This was the so-called 'Clemency' Proclamation. It did not at the moment harmonise with the wishes of a large section of public opinion in England, which, maddened by the sufferings of friends and relations, demanded an indiscriminating policy of vengeance and reprisals.

success is the great broad test of doing well, and before the last mail I began to funk. I never was so pleased as by the news of the last mail. You have with your own resources broken the neck of the most formidable revolt known in our history. Elgin has acted very well, and to him the disappointment must be great.[1] Pam is determined to abolish the Company. Vernon Smith is to have a plan prepared for the next Cabinet. Clarendon and Charles Wood are the principal objectors. I think Pam is right. The double Government, although it has great advantages, is an anomaly, and at present, directed by very ordinary men, cannot withstand the shock of this great disaster. Whether the public will stand the Government being handed over to Lord Smith, with or without a Council, is a very different thing; and the new East India Bill may very likely, as its predecessor before, be the cause of the upsetting of a very popular Government. One of Pam's motives is to do something great, which may distinguish his Premiership. Another is to have something which will act as a damper to Reform. Nothing would be more fatal than to attempt to burke all reform; but if we propose a moderate measure, I dare say we shall not have much trouble about it. Ellenborough continues writing to me, but abstains from all criticism. He is evidently preparing a speech, which is to eclipse Burke and Sheridan, and crumble you and us to the dust. He is, as somebody said, in a state of sanguine despondency, and has no doubt of the nation insisting upon his replacing you. Ridiculous as this is, if you had very bad luck, I should not be surprised at the cry of the *Daily News* being taken up.

'I have been reading Jacob Omnium's pamphlet on Light Horse.[2] It appears to me to be unanswerable. I have been teasing everybody about it, and have been a little instrumental in getting authority for the East India Company to raise a corps of light men lightly accoutred. Pray, when you get them, patronise them; that is to say, see that they have fair play. Lady G. is come back from her visit to her mother in good health and spirits. Johnny Acton is busy about an historical work, which from what I hear will be remarkable. I hope that it will not be as described admiringly by Lady Camden, "so clever that nobody will be able to understand it." He has, I am glad to say, a yearning for public life. I was at Ashridge last week. A magnificent place, an immense house of bad architecture, but with fine rooms. I was forced, against my inclination, to act the Knave of

[1] Lord Elgin departed from China to Calcutta at the head of the reinforcements to the British army in India, and then, returning to Hong Kong, remained there till September 25, 1857. His mission meanwhile remained in abeyance.

[2] Mr. Higgins, who wrote under the above pseudonym.

Hearts in a burlesque written by Augustus Stafford. You will be glad to hear that I took a prominent part in the choruses. I presume you do not practise that art much at present. . . .

LONDON, *November* 9, 1857.

'I was much perturbed at getting at Chatsworth, immediately after my last letter to you, a note from Vernon Smith, asking me to call on him, as he did not know what to write to you about your Proclamation; that Palmerston strongly disapproved of it, and that he thought it ill-timed. The mail was gone, but I called on Vernon Smith as soon as I returned to town. I told him that I entirely approved of the Proclamation; and that I did not understand, if it was right, how it could be ill-timed. I said, however, that any disapprobation of it would be so serious a matter, that of course he would bring it before the Cabinet before acting. He said he would, but that he had written you a private letter.

'At the Cabinet, it was soon evident to Clarendon and to me tha the god of love had never read the Proclamation. Vernon Smith proposed a modified disapproval as a substitute for the complete approbation of the Court. I defended the Proclamation in the way I thought best adapted to convince Pam. I was strongly seconded by Harrowby, and by short judicious hints from Clarendon. All the rest of the Cabinet on our side.

'Pam himself proposed that, instead of even moderate disapprobation, you should be informed that we approved the principles of the order; but as you had sent no despatch with it, we should like to know all the facts on which you grounded the issue of it.

'I had intended to take a strong measure, if disapprobation had been expressed, but I quite concurred in Pam's proposal. I am afraid you will make out much too good a case. The only iota of a doubt which I have about it, is whether there were not some unnecessary details. I have no doubt of the importance of making it a public instead of a private circular, but you may as well notice this point.

'Pam praised your general vigour, judgment, and courage. He doubts about the Proclamation, and about your not having earlier disarmed the Dinapore sepoys. Was this urged upon you, and why did you decline?

'On my return to Chatsworth I read an article in the *Daily News*, so full of falsehoods that I determined to put myself on a dinner at the Mansion House in honour of the Duke of Cambridge.[1] After I had done this, on the morning of the dinner I was glad to get letters

[1] At this dinner Lord Granville made a very effective speech in defence of Lord Canning. See below, pp. 291–292.

from Argyll and Clanricarde, blowing up the Government for not defending you from the unjust and untrue assumptions and accusations.

'I got Clarendon to have a serious conversation with Delane, who is just come back from a holiday. The *Times*, you will observe, won't give itself up, but, I flatter myself, is veering round. I wish you would write to Clarendon to tell him that you are grateful for his very friendly exertions in all ways on your behalf. You are so busy that it is difficult, but still one of the few accusations which I am inclined to believe is, that you have considerably snubbed some of those Calcutta people, lawyers and others. A little soft-sawder *à la* Pam would be useful. I never was more convinced than that you have already made a great and lasting reputation. There is much praise of you in all sorts of newspapers where one would not expect it, and which you probably do not see.

'Poor Lady Stewart was annoyed at their not listening well to my speech at the Mansion House, of which I hope you will not entirely disapprove, although I had some difficulties. I was afraid of going an inch beyond what Pam would approve. The audience had been a moderate one to all, even to the Duke of Cambridge. I unluckily made them quite silent at first. I was applauded throughout by the intelligent, but at the lower end they got bored to death by what was a long story. I am, however, told that it has been of use. Pam wrote to tell me that it could not have been better.

'The Queen is the strongest Canningite I ever saw. The Prince proves philosophically that you are one of the greatest men living. They both talk excellent sense about the cruelty question. Lord Lansdowne is a constant admirer; W. Alexander, Norman, Freddy, Shelburne, C. Gore, all your friends are useful in society and clubs. I am a little nervous about the next telegram. If Lucknow is not relieved, and if Grant has made a fool of himself, it will be laid most unjustly to you. Best love to Lady C.'

LONDON, *November* 10, 1857.

'On thinking over my letter of yesterday, which (like Ellenborough) I did not read over, but left to be put in the post, I am afraid that I must have given you some false impressions of Pam and of Vernon Smith. They were both inclined to be wrong about the Proclamation, but nothing can be more fair or friendly about you than the President of the Board of Control; and Pam's speech of last night will convince you of his cordial support. It was most judicious, and I am delighted that it should go out by this mail, in time to blow away any weakening to your authority which might arise from the virulent attacks of the *Daily News* and some portions of the press.

You see how dexterously and how self-complacently Delane is extricating the *Times* from the false position as regards you into which Dasent had put it. Write to Pam by return of post. A line to Lord Lansdowne, thanking him for the friendly interest which he has shown about you, will please him and his belongings. Tell the Prince and the Queen that you know what support they have been to you. All these little trespasses upon your time are a bore, but I am sure they are *tanti*. Never mind writing to me, but put somebody in communication with me as to rumours, and the answers to them. You and Lady Canning will be shocked at the want of humanity in my speeches, but both at Manchester and at the Mansion House the reporters left out the bits about it. Pam last night spat out in his most emphatic and decided manner all about you.

'We are to reform the Government of India, but we are horribly puzzled about reforming ourselves. Pam, I believe, is for a Reform Bill, but a very small one. There is great commercial pressure; money at ten per cent. I do not see why things are immediately to improve. There will be a great want of employment in the manufacturing districts this winter. If you pacify India rapidly, it is just on the cards that India may be partially forgotten by the meeting of Parliament.

'Argyll writes furious at the mildness of my defence of you. He is right, but in ignorance of how far Pam would back me up; and knowing how fatal to you any difference between us would be, I thought it right to be prudent. The telegram won't come in; I am dying for it. Pam is a good deal knocked up by his speech. The Cabinet very favourable to you. G. Grey showed me a very good letter from the Bear entirely approving you and your conduct. God bless you.'

LADY CANNING TO LORD GRANVILLE.

CALCUTTA, *November* 10, 1857.

'Canning begged me to write you a word, and I have not five minutes. He thanks you for your good suggestion about furnishing explanations to the subjects of grievance and complaint sent home. A good opportunity for this has now occurred, for the petition to the Queen for his recall enumerates all of them, and a dispassionate commentary on it, topic by topic, he hopes goes home by this mail to the Board.

'Sir Colin is across the Ganges, and has 5,000 men ready to go into Lucknow when all preparations are made; but you must await the result one mail more. General Outram can hold out; and, with economy of food, till the end of the month. General Windham commands the reserve at Cawnpore.

'Still the English troops are only on the road up. Two or three regiments. All in "the front" are Chinese and others not from England. Captain Peel is there, and heavy guns, but not 68-pounders, I grieve to say. We have officers arriving in shoals, and entertain them perpetually. I am so provoked to have missed Sir G. Gregson, but it was his fault for not calling; he was four days here.

'Canning is so refreshed by the cold weather; it has set in early. Everything is certainly very much brighter on our side. I hope Lord Elphinstone's anxieties are going off. Sir J. Lawrence now has a little degree of disturbance in parts. The steamers with whom Government made the bargain of forfeits over seventy days have answered perfectly. The auxiliary screws as slow as ever, and the sailing ships slower than ever.[1] A cyclone met and delayed some last week. Captain Lowe, A.D.C. to General Anson, and all others go home this mail; he brought the Delhi despatch and can tell all about it. I hope you all admired the heroic deeds done in all parts, Delhi, Lucknow, and the rest.'

LORD GRANVILLE TO LORD CANNING.

LONDON, *November* 16, 1857.

'I did not know of this post till to-day. The last mail brought us first a telegram, which made us all triumphant, and convinced me that the whole thing would soon be over, and then some letters which leave us anxious about Lucknow. I am still very sanguine about the moral effect of the fall of Delhi.[2] Ellenborough writes a gloomy letter, and the *Times* published to-day a letter from its Calcutta correspondent, which is meant to be tolerably fair, but which is very much the reverse. It all goes upon the division of feeling between the Indian Government (you) and the Europeans. I suppose there can be no doubt of the feeling. The Calcutta public were frightened out of their wits, and have since comforted themselves by vowing vengeance against the whole "black" race. You have taken the calm and statesmanlike view throughout, and they, instigated by the frantic Indian press, are angry with you. I

[1] Sir Charles Wood, First Lord of the Admiralty, was severely criticised for employing sailing vessels to carry some of the troops to India, instead of relying exclusively on the new screw steamers. In his defence in Parliament he mentioned four screw steamers which had undertaken to perform the journey in 74 days, but had occupied, one of them 107, another 121, a third 100, and a fourth 90 days; while the best sailing vessels could be relied on to do the journey in from 90 to 100 days. Unfortunately the sailing vessels entirely belied these favourable expectations. (See *Annual Register* for 1857, p. 137.)

[2] Delhi was taken on September 20, 1857. Brigadier (afterwards Sir) Archdale Wilson, who had succeeded General Reid, being in command of the British forces.

believe that the meeting of Parliament may be of use for you. You will see by the papers that we have had a monetary crisis, that we have sent a letter to the Bank, and are obliged to assemble Parliament on December 3 in order to get an Act of Indemnity passed.

'Lord Aberdeen is poorly again. Lord Lansdowne has made a great rally. Vernon Smith delighted with a letter from you, acknowledging his support. A line to people to this effect has a wonderful power, and is useful. I cannot help thinking that you might usefully condescend to some frivolous means of putting some of the leading people in the press and in Calcutta society on your side. Clanricarde has made an excellent speech, in which he talks of you. Your sister sent it to me; I have sent it to the *Globe*. I imagine that it is useless sending anything abusing the *Times*, for publication in that journal.'

BUCKENHAM, *November* 24, 1857.

'I ought to have been at a Cabinet, instead of which I have had a wonderful day's shooting here.

'The more sensible people I see, the more I think that there is a great advantage for you in Parliament meeting now, although you must expect a little abuse.[1] Colin Campbell writes that we are fortunate in having so able a chief, so perfect a gentleman, and so admirable a man of business. Mansfield writes in similar terms. Mr. Grote writes to his sister-in-law at History Hut, that your calmness is unpopular with the panic-stricken community of Calcutta, but that nobody can have done better than you. I am sorry you will not hear of going up away from Calcutta, but you must be the best judge.

'Shaftesbury, who was one of the principal instigators of the foolish nonsense talked about the Proclamation, is now praising you and abusing the Calcutta people.

'We shall have a very serious winter here; Lancashire, Yorkshire, and Staffordshire all out of employment. Half the ironmasters in South Staffordshire are gone. If we manage to hold on, it will do us good in the end. 'Yours affectionately, G.'[2]

LORD CANNING TO LORD GRANVILLE.

November 25, 1857.

'MY DEAR GRANVILLE,—Here is nothing but a line of manuscript for you, but, as in some sort answering your suggestion of a *résumé* of charges and answers, I send you a copy of a petition for my recall, with comments upon the facts which it professes to allege.

[1] A winter session had been decided upon.

[2] The letters of Lord and Lady Canning between July 20 and November 25 are unfortunately not extant.

'I have picked out some newspaper charges, too, but have not had leisure to write one word upon them for this mail.

'I hope that the next will arrive before Parliament has met; but if it does not, I dare say the petition, annotated, may serve for something in correcting misstatements.

'I have written a long letter to Vernon Smith, which ask to see.

'I have accepted 8,000 or 10,000 men from Jung Bahadoor, which Vernon Smith won't like. But don't let him be afraid; I will stake my head that he will play us no tricks; indeed, I shall deserve to lose it if he does.

'Adieu. Love to Bruton Street, Berkeley Square, Cleveland ditto, Pall Mall.'

LORD GRANVILLE TO LORD CANNING.

LONDON, *December* 10, 1857.

'My prediction by the last mail has been entirely justified. The meeting of Parliament has been useful to the Government, and has cleared the atmosphere of the political world; but it has been especially advantageous to you, both from what has been said, and as much from what has not been said.[1] There was abroad a sort of vague rumour and belief that a violent attack was to be made upon you, and that you would be utterly destroyed. Derby and Dizzy have made attacks which, although ungenerous from Derby, who prefaced them with a declaration that he wished to deal tenderly with you, were not even intended to wound very severely. Ellenborough, while he attacked your measures, made admissions which will be of great use to you personally, and to the future good government of India. Grey's speech in the House of Lords was the best and most effective I ever heard him make. Old Lansdowne was delighted with the night (the second upon India, December 7). Everybody tells me that public opinion is rallying fast to you. I saw Russell yesterday, who does not go out till the 26th. You will find him well inclined, and I hope you will be civil to him. Delane's correspondence seems to be wholly from the discontented clique, excepting that of his brother, who must be a very good fellow from the letters which I have seen, and who swears by you, although, as far as I can learn, you neither see him nor do anything for him.

'I defended your Press Restriction Act, and think that the defence might be made still more logically convincing; but I have

[1] Parliament met early in December 1857. Lord Derby at once attacked the Government for remissness in not sending out reinforcements, and insinuated charges against Lord Canning in connection with the attempts of missionaries to interfere with the religion of the natives of India.

some doubts as to whether it was *tanti*; whether threats to both English and natives, with an appeal to the patriotic feelings (which they do not possess) of the English editors, would not have been more useful. Macaulay thinks the Civil Service in India is very thin-skinned about press attacks.

'Letters praising you up to the skies come in from all sides, but some of your best friends say that your Council is weak, and that your secretarial staff, chosen by Lord Dalhousie, is not strong. I am annoyed at thinking that all your accounts from England will be of an unsatisfactory character till you receive Pam's speech, and that, on the other hand, we shall feel the effects of the rebound from India till that speech has been read and digested there. This will be only at the opening of Parliament, which is fixed for February 4. A friend of yours and I discussed whether you would mind newspaper abuse. We settled not one single bit for a long time, but then it was possible you might feel it acutely. I hope that we are quite wrong. You may depend upon it you are building up a great reputation. Poor Harrowby has resigned from ill health: it is not yet known.[1] Pam will not take this good opportunity of remodelling his Government. He does not like the thoughts of Grey or J. Russell, and does not think (in which he is right) that Sidney Herbert would join. The plan for the Indian Government will be a President or Secretary of State with a Council of old Indians. I should have preferred the omission of the latter, if the change is made at all, but I stand alone.

'Macaulay thinks Vernon Smith, being in his present office, will be a great difficulty. He is more intelligent than Mars; but he has not go enough, quarrels with everybody, and his reputation is below his merits. Macaulay, who would like to see Johnny take his place, was so complimentary as to recommend that I should be put there, if a really good man could not be found in the Commons. I should be quite unequal to it, and should dislike it at the present moment, and the public would not approve. I believe Ellenborough sits at Southam surrounded by postage stamps, waiting for the nation to call for him as a second Chatham to save the Indian Empire, whether from Downing Street, Cannon Row, or Calcutta, he does not think important.

'Good judges think nothing can shake Pam's popularity, but that, with the principal debaters against him, his colleagues will never be able to make a stand on questions such as India and Commons Reform. . . .

'To revert to politics: Trevelyan and Sir G. Clerk think that the

[1] Lord Harrowby was Lord Privy Seal.

two great things to be done are the reorganisation of the army and finance. They both agreed that there was not such a thing as a real financier in India, and that you ought to have first-rate accountants, men like Anderson of the Treasury, sent out to you. Pray apply for this. It must be of importance, and it will be a glorious feather in your cap, if you were able to re-establish the finances before you leave India.

'I would not lose a moment, and if you will let me know, I will help to look after a good selection of men. My best and kindest love to Lady Canning. Although I write such stupid letters, I can assure you that I am absorbed with you and your doings in India. You would be pleased to see the interest and excitement all your friends feel about you.'

LADY CANNING TO LORD GRANVILLE.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE, *December* 10, 1857.

'I think you are glad of any amount of Indian news, so I will write without waiting to know whether Canning has time for a letter to you or not. Pray always answer to him, rather than to me, for your letters are so welcome.

'There has been rather a *crise* in the last fortnight, but of late things have gone beautifully, and a fresh victory announced this morning completes the defeat of the Gwalior force, and all its *forty* guns must be taken. I remember 5 and 2, and 16 and 15.

'Sir Colin's victory at Cawnpore was a pattern performance, so much done so coolly and deliberately, and with so little loss; and this fresh pursuit of Brigadier Grant's is successful, and not one man lost, though *fifteen* guns and baggage and everything is taken. We are so happy to know of all the women and children and wounded safe in Allahabad. General Windham defeated the advance guard of the Gwalior force on the 26th or 25th very satisfactorily, but it was followed up by some incomplete disastrous affair, of which private letters give very dreadful versions, and some horrid stories are going about.[1] I hope despatches with details may come in good time for this mail, for one hardly dares to pronounce the stories untrue, though we disbelieve them. These Cawnpore affairs bad and good, pray remember, are the first-fruits of the army sent from England. Sir Colin had only China troops and others at Lucknow.

'We heard on the 29th of 20,000 Oude men threatening the frontier of Juanpore behind Benares, and it was likely enough when they had no inducement to stay at Lucknow that they

[1] General Windham had been repulsed in an attack on the Gwalior Contingent on November 27, but Sir Colin Campbell finally defeated it on December 6, 1857.

should come down upon the most important and the richest districts. Canning had to reinforce the few troops and Goorkas in those parts with all speed, and to send a very energetic and very unpopular Colonel Franks, who would do that sort of work well, to command. There is nothing more said of all this at present, and I suppose that danger is past, and Jung Bahadoor will be soon on the Oude frontier.[1] All these events have retarded Canning's departure for the Upper Provinces a little, as it is necessary for him to keep where he can be in free communication on all sides as far as possible. Nearly all the troops have arrived, and the Calcutta public has been surprised and alarmed at finding them dreadfully fond of the grog shops, and very often very unruly. The Highlanders, I grieve to say, were the worst, for the officers of the Connaught Rangers put their men off without landing in the town. Some measures have been enforced to keep the shops in order and to withdraw licences from the worst, and a little encampment is put up with a canteen and games, and wholesome drinks and good, rather than bad, spirits. I am afraid it is not yet as attractive as the bad shops and crowded streets, but all is quiet, and only some sober regiments are here at this moment.

'My temper is the worse for reading the English papers, and I do not quite like some letters even which imply that when Canning does what my friends do not like, it is the Council and not himself that deserves blame. Now praise or blame, let it all be his own and no one else's! Except for the time expended in Council once a week, and in sending round papers, I doubt if he will find much difference or gain when he is away. I hope he will be spared some routine work, but that is all.

'As to the instructions to the civil officers on the treatment of offenders, &c., it seems to me to deserve neither blame nor great credit; it is such a matter-of-fact piece of justice, and its object is to secure uniformity in dealing with those sepoys who are not obviously guilty and with arms in their hands. I say always that I do not think the objects of "Canning's clemency" can find it a virtue to their liking; for the best that happens to them is to be imprisoned by a civil authority, and kept in prison till he can hand them over to a military authority; and this latter authority does what he pleases, and I should think will not be gentle, and Canning is as much for strict and stern justice as the Duke of Cambridge or the *Times*, and it *is* a necessity.[2] Anyone who says this paper cramps military power must have judged by the writings copied from Calcutta papers, and cannot have read the document itself. A *Proclamation* is not

[1] Jung Bahadoor, Prince of Nepaul.

[2] The so-called 'Clemency' Proclamation had been issued on July 31, 1857.

the name for it. It need never have been published, but it could not be kept *secret*, as it was widely circulated amongst civil authorities. As to burning of villages, pray look at Sir C. Napier's remarks, when he found civil authorities so much inclined to that punishment amongst mountain robbers. Next year when things quiet down people may be glad that rich districts are not depopulated and thrown out of cultivation. I am always dipping into that curious book, *Indian Misgovernment*. There is so much that illustrates the state of things here just before the outbreak. When one hears of Government caught napping, of being unprepared, of disregarding warnings, &c. &c., how curious it is to see how Sir C. Napier when watching for mutiny with his eyes wide open, and expecting it to spread through nearly half the army, never wanted more English troops, never dreaded the sort of thing we have seen, never imagined that this same army would not suffice to defend the frontier, and above all never wanted the magazine taken away from Delhi or Europeans put to protect it; only wished it moved from one position to another from danger of explosion, and how he once snubbed an officer who required a proportion of European soldiers to be quartered with natives, and to go with them on active service. Sir C. Napier's eyes were keen enough, and he had far more distinct warnings than the cartridge question gave us.

'The Edinburgh Reviewer has a capital article, to my mind, but he had made one mistake in supposing the disbanding of the 34th at Barrackpore was *after* Sir H. Lawrence's acts and in consequence of them. The order was given long before, and it had only been so long pending because there seemed reason to believe more information could be got as to the causes of disaffection, and because there was some chance of men throwing light upon those vague stories of plots. This case of the 34th was a very complicated one, for it was a bad regiment and had certainly misled the other; and after two men were hanged, every possible means were taken to leave no stone unturned that might bring the truth to light. I hope the world is satisfied at last that Canning and Sir Colin are the best friends possible, and that he is not tied with red tape.

'I do not know what the last new lies may be, but I see the overland papers are making much of the strange unaccountable mutinies at Chittagong and Dacca—three companies of the 34th and two of the 73rd. A mischievous announcement, in both cases of an intention to disarm, fired off both. There is but the rest of the 73rd now left to mutiny, and precautions are taken to prevent mischief, but there has never been a possibility of quietly sending up a force to pounce upon it and disarm it unawares. The officers know what

hangs over them. They have enlisted Goorkas; and English invalids are near, and perhaps they may still hold in their men—it is not very likely, I fear.

'General Ashburnham is here—there is no command vacant for him, and I do not know what he is to do; he is meanwhile staying with us and very pleasant. He knows so many odds and ends of Indian history, and seems to have lived intimately with all the notorious characters. Nana Sahib's agent was his servant.

'We are so very sorry for poor General Havelock.[1] A private letter says he died of dysentery and was quite worn out; he must have heard he was K.C.B. I think that Lucknow despatch will live in history as a story equal to that of Zaragossa. We have still a gap to be filled up, before Sir Colin's despatch, which you will have by this mail; I have not seen it yet. Outram's story is not yet recorded, or probably it has been sent and lost.

'Canning is looking so much better now it is cold weather.'

LORD CANNING TO LORD GRANVILLE.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE, *December* 11, 1857.

'I send you a heap of material—chiefly newspaper stories—and the truth, in parallel columns; also a conclusive (I hope) defence of the "clemency orders" in an official despatch, but I had more to say on that head which could not come into a despatch—if there were time. I have also sent two addresses, presented to me only yesterday, from the Hindoo rajahs, zemindars, and merchants of Bengal, Behar, and Orissa. The one (the shortest) signed by five thousand persons, and at the head of them all the men of best family and of highest influence amongst the Hindoos in Calcutta and for hundreds of miles round. The other is not yet signed in full. I am to have it next week. It is a less antagonistic production (the first, I fear, will do mischief, and increase the irritation amongst the European malcontents, but I knew nothing of it until a few days before it came), having been drawn up by some who did not like the tone of the first for the above reason.

'At the head of them, i.e. the signers of the long one, is the Rajah of Burdwan, a sort of midland-county coal owner of Bengal, and about the richest. He pays half a million of land revenue to the State annually. In fact, the subscribers of the two papers do comprise, I really believe, all who have the deepest stake in the prosperity and peace of the Presidency and in the permanence of British rule.

'I could write a chapter in deprecation of anything being done or

[1] Sir Henry Havelock died of dysentery, November 24, 1857.

said in Parliament by the Government which shall tend to throw cold water upon the policy that has been pursued towards the natives. Look at a map (never think of Indian matters without looking at a map, and without bringing your mind to take in the scale of the map and size of this country). Look at a map. With all the reinforcements you have sent (all the Bengal ones are arrived except 800 men), Bengal is without a single European soldier more than we had at the beginning of the mutinies; Calcutta alone excepted, which is stronger. Twenty-three thousand men have moved through Bengal, and in Bengal we are still dependent (mainly) upon the goodwill (I cannot say affection) and interests (well understood by themselves) of the natives. Suppose (not an impossibility, although I hope not a likelihood), suppose that hostilities train on, and that we do not make our way with Oude, and other disturbed places—that our strength becomes again a subject of doubt—will it not be the part of a wise Government to keep such a population as that of the three great Lower Provinces in a loyal frame of temper? Can you do so if you proscribe and scout as untrustworthy whole classes? Look at the short address, and see how the conduct and language of the Europeans have rankled in the hearts of men who (I speak of some score of the principal subscribers) have nothing whatever to fear or lose from being abused or thought unworthy of office and trust—who are thoroughly independent, and could buy a Staffordshire coal owner out of house and home? Is it not clear that we are making enemies of men not on account of personal and small grievances, but on account of broad national insults?

'For God's sake raise your voice and stop this. As long as I have breath in my body *I* will pursue no other policy than that which I have been following—not only for the reason of expediency and policy above stated, but because it is just. I will not govern in anger. Justice, and that as stern and inflexible as law and might can make it, I will deal out. But I will never allow an angry or indiscriminating act or word to proceed from the Government of India as long as I am responsible for it. Everybody says that they want to punish only the guilty—of course they say so; but then why do they find fault with the orders of July 31? What do they do but establish a check and caution against including innocent with guilty, and facilitate (yes, actually facilitate) the action of the military against the guilty? But on this read the despatch.

'I am *very* much vexed at the reports of disagreement with Sir Colin. I have never had a difference with him. On one point (the despatches go home to-day), on suspension of promotion in the Bengal Army, I agreed with him at first, but after a few weeks saw

reason to change my view, and I have reason to think that he acquiesces. I mention this trifle only because, having mentioned it, I can add that I have never had *any* other difference. We discuss things, and joke together in my room about meddling civilians and pipe-clay colonels, but in nothing that has had to be done have we ever had an approach to disunion. I have his last letter by me. If I was to put it into this case, you would, on reading it, see how unequal to the whole truth these mere negations of mine are. The letter is really all but affectionate. It would expose the infernal lie that has been put about, and which I hear is believed by some who should know better ; but I will not abuse the poor old man's confidence by turning his warm, open-hearted words to any such wretched purpose. The lie may live its life and die, which it may have done by this time.

'If this is not so, and if you think any good could come of it, you might ask the Duke of Cambridge what Sir Colin Campbell says of our relations. I know that in the last days of October he wrote to the Duke expressing his feelings about the support he had received from me, and perhaps the Duke of Cambridge might not object to its being referred to *en temps et lieu*.

'Good-bye, my dear Granville. I am very grateful for all you have said and done ; in spite of my giving so little time to writing. I don't care two straws for the abuse of the papers, British or Indian. I am for ever wondering at myself for not doing so, but it really is the fact. Partly from want of time to care, partly because with an enormous task before me all other cares look small. I am not so audacious as to say I see my way clearly to the accomplishment of it, but I do see my way to the avoidance of some dangers, which if not avoided in time will make India ungovernable by England. I should like to go back to that chapter again ; to show you how impossible it is that for generations to come Englishmen should be more than a handful (more or less small) in this vast country, and how powerless for good they will be (to say nothing of the risks and other drawbacks of their position) if they, and still more if their rulers, take up as their means of defence the mistrusting, branding, and proscribing of whole classes. We shall do what no Government has ever done in any country (so far as I know) without repenting it. We shall do what in our weakest day we have never before done in India. Pray, pray arrest the evil, if tendencies in England are still in that direction.

'I don't want you to puff anything that I may do, or to do more than defend me against any unfair or mistaken attack. But do take up and assert boldly that whilst we are prepared, as the first duty of

all, to strike down resistance without mercy wherever it shows itself, we acknowledge that, resistance over, deliberate justice and calm patient reason are to resume their sway; that we are not going, either in anger or from indolence, to punish wholesale; whether by wholesale hangings and burnings, or by the less violent but not one jot less offensive course of refusing trust and countenance and favour and honour to any man because he is of a class or a creed. Do this, and get others to do it, and you will serve India more than you would believe. Had not the "clemency" question been taken up as it has been taken up in India, I really believe that the cry would never have been heard of again, even in Calcutta. The orders of July served as a peg for abuse for a few weeks; but they had been forgotten, and there has been nothing in the working of them to raise a cavil. The *Times* has done incalculable mischief by giving a new start to this cry, and the second article, by which it appeared to modify the first (written, I think, by Marshman), made matters rather worse, just as an apology is often worse than the offence. I have, however, great faith in Parliament on this one question, though by no means on all others concerning India.

'As to newspapers generally, I must open my heart to you and tell you that I think the Government might have taken the trouble to contradict the lies about Sir Colin and me; or if not confident enough of their falsity to contradict them, it was surely easy to say that the Government had no reason to believe them. But (whilst I am about it) from nobody but yourself, Vernon Smith, and Argyll, have I had a helping hand since troubles began. Of yourself you know what I think, and I need not repeat it. To Vernon Smith I am most grateful. He has stood up for the Governor-General most gallantly, and I shall never forget it. Argyll's answer to Ellenborough was as good as could be. But Lord Lansdowne, with the best will, didn't defend his absent friend discreetly (by the bye, you have never told me what you thought of my missionary subscription case), and Palmerston has never uttered a word of defence or approval. I incline to think he did not approve, at the time, of what was done about the China force, but if so he ought to have told me so. Anyhow, the fact remains that the head of the Government has never held out a little finger to me, although not for want of opportunities. This is not like him, so I suppose there *is* a reason for it. Here you have my only grumble, and, as I said before, such things don't vex nearly as much as I should have expected.

'I have just seen the *Edinburgh*. It falls into the mistake of the Red Pamphlet. I did not determine to disband the 34th men *after* Henry Lawrence's proceedings at Lucknow. My minute is

dated three or four days before his affair took place. Who wrote the article?

'Give my love to Lady Granville, and say what sums I would give for an evening in Bruton Street.'

LORD GRANVILLE TO LORD CANNING.

WILTON, *December* 23, 1857.

'I wish you joy ten millions of times. We have just received the news of the taking of Lucknow.[1] I consider all your troubles now at an end, although not your labour and minor difficulties. This completes the good fortune of Palmerston and his Government, for which nothing could be more favourable than the short session which we have had. I believe I said in my last letter that nothing could be better for you than the little which was said, and the much which was not said. The last day George Grey told me that the Duke of Cambridge had a letter from Sir Colin, in which he related how satisfactory his relations had been with you, and that it was a pity it was not publicly read. I went to the Duke, and suggested his reading it at the last sitting of the House. He said he had already thought of it, and that he would do so at once. He found, however, that we sat at the same hour as he was holding his levée, and he begged me to read it in his name. I thought it would come better from Panmure; besides, it is not desirable that I should appear too much in the light of your Major Scott.[2] You can have no idea how much the tide of society opinion has turned in your favour. It is useless to deny that at one time it ran hard against you.

'The proposed change in the Indian Government has been communicated to the chairs, and it is expected that it will create a good deal of difficulty, but I believe the country is with us. It will be a subject of some embarrassment to you while the change is pending. It will afterwards be, I should think, a comfort to you. One of the great difficulties is "Mr. Smith of Cannon Row," as the administrative reformers who complain of the aristocratic character of the Government call the President of the Board of Control. He is exceedingly unpopular, is thought to be (unjustly) a poor creature, and often manages to do and say things without any tact, and his trousers, as Clarendon says, are so very offensive. I should like to make him a Duke, give you to Grey, the War Office to Sidney Herbert, and the Privy Seal to Panmure. Instead of this, the Privy Seal, vacated by Harrowby, whose health is seriously affected, is to be given to Clanricarde. Our Reform Bill will be more than will be expected

[1] Lucknow was relieved by Sir Henry Havelock, September 26, 1857.

[2] The agent of Warren Hastings. See *Memoirs of Warren Hastings*, by the Rev. G. R. Gleig, ii. 354, iii. 32.

from Pam. An extension of county franchise, the giving votes to many classes who are now excluded, but no lowering of the borough franchise; a partial disfranchisement, and an addition of members to a few counties and to a few large towns.

'We came here on Monday. I hunted with Tom Smith's hounds on my way; a bad day; shot yesterday the Hare Warren, 660 head, and hunted again without sport to-day. The tone of the master of this house is very hostile to the Government. Indeed, Lord Aberdeen told me that he was sure that he would never part from Gladstone. It is a great pity. I dread this session as a great breaker-up of parties, and making the future very difficult. There are no young men but Lord Stanley who promise much. He is a very clever fellow, but his speaking does not improve. Pray think of your health. Captain Lowe says you never go out. This cannot be a good economy of time.'

LORD CANNING TO LORD GRANVILLE.

CALCUTTA, *December* 24, 1857.

'I despise myself for sending you this letter from Sir Colin—making capital, even to you, out of the kind-hearted old soldier's unreserved outpourings. But I can't resist it, for it shows in a short space and pretty conclusively three things: (1) the terms upon which we are with each other; (2) the perfect sympathy of his military with my civil policy; (3) and that, at least, he does not find any drag put upon his forwardness. Pray keep it to yourself. It is sent only to enable you to hold with more complete confidence the language which my former letter will have led you to hold upon my bare assurance.

'It is very odd that this infernal lie about Sir Colin is the one which still vexes me the most, in spite of the Duke of Cambridge's considerate contradiction, Palmerston's, and your own. I can understand the reports of vacillation, imbecility, deception, cowardice, &c. &c. &c. Every man is privileged to think those who differ from him to be knaves or fools; and many who say all this honestly believe that they can prove it all by my acts. But I'll defy any man to believe—even if he could have posted the most malignant spy to hear and see everything that passed between the Commander-in-Chief and the Governor-General from the morning when the former walked into my room from the steamer until the night when he left for Cawnpore—I'll defy any man to believe that he has a tittle of evidence to show disagreement between us. It is not that the fact is not so, but that everything connected with our intercourse is so diametrically and violently contrary to the supposition.

'And then as to red tape. Why, if there was anything to blame in the way in which business was done between us, it is that no official record remains of many things each of which would have involved (according to ordinary practice) a correspondence between two or three departments—sometimes more—before it would have been accomplished. Movements of regiments and detachments, appointments of officers, collecting of supplies, stopping or sending on of steamers, and half a hundred such like jobs were discussed, settled, and very frequently ordered to be executed by a message sent at once through Talbot to the telegraph, and not known to the departments concerned for twenty-four hours or more. It is no exaggeration to say that by having the Commander-in-Chief under my own roof, and discussing business with him in this fashion, a day at least was saved upon most of the orders given, and a hundred ambiguities and misunderstandings between officers avoided.

'But I hope this folly is disposed of. It really is the only one which has disturbed my equanimity.

'You ask about Dinapore. The whole story is told in a note to the petition of recall. I don't think I can usefully add anything to what is there said.

'But there is a good deal of misapprehension, here as well as in England, as to the practicability and the wisdom of disarming. It is a measure which has been expedient or not according to circumstances of which none but those on the spot, or possessed of full information, could judge.

'I send you in this (or another) cover a very rough memorandum which will explain what I mean. It is a fragment of a full memorandum upon the mutinies which I have been designing for some time; but which the current and increasing burden of every day makes it physically impossible for me to sit down to. But I will try to send you other fragments from time to time, on the chance of some turning out useful. I shall send a copy of this same to Vernon Smith, lest the fat should be in the fire.

'Don't run away with the prejudices against Hope Grant. As to his liberating 150 rebels, I beg you to ask for a minute of mine of this day's date (December 24). The force of lying can no further go than it has gone in that story—always excepting the Colin calumny. I think that the minute and papers should be given to Parliament.

'The addresses and the answers to them go to you to-day. The answer to the one which abuses the Europeans is a little short of what it ought to have been in the way of rebuke, but it was very difficult steering. For the address really speaks the truth.

'The short *catalogues raisonnés* of a few of the leading subscribers might have been extended, but would not have conveyed more that would be intelligible to English readers. I wish the addresses had been more measured in their compliments. It would have been more useful to me.

'Once more, my dear Granville, many many thanks to you. You do not know what a pleasure and a comfort it is to feel that there you are. I don't see how I am likely ever to have an opportunity of doing anything like the same service by you, and it makes me unhappy to feel this.

'I behave shamefully to correspondents, but there is no help for it. 'Ever your affectionate C.'

CALCUTTA, *December* 24, 1857.

'How shall I thank you for all you have done? There never was a more thoughtful, judicious, generous friend; and the only return I can make is to take care that you shall have no reason to repent or be ashamed.

'As regards my instructions of July 31—I believe that the despatches of this mail, coupled with those of the last, will show you that my case stands on a rock—and it is even stronger than appears in the despatches—as I will explain presently.

'But *is it possible* that the Cabinet thought of sending out a disapproval of those instructions?[1] If they did, they little know with what edged tools they are playing. If I have been wrong I do not deprecate disapproval; but for God's sake don't throw blame publicly (it would be public in twenty-four hours) upon your Governor-General at this time, lightly. This I would say of disapproval upon almost any subject; but as regards this particular case have you (the Government, I mean) considered the tendency of the spirit of exasperation against natives which is rampant here, and to which your disapproval would have given new fury? for it would have been caught up immediately as chiming in with the cry which has been raised here against the instructions, and whatever might have been your own meaning, the "Saxon domination" party, as they call themselves, would have claimed the support of the Queen's Government.

'I implore you to think of the consequences which we are laying up for ourselves by fostering the feeling which is now abroad. You

[1] These were the instructions addressed to the commissioners and the magistrates who were to deal with captured or surrendered rebels. It was the sequel of the 'Clemency' Proclamation.

cannot countenance it in the Europeans without raising it in the natives too, and how is India to have peace if it is once roused and general?

'I suspect there is a hallucination on one point, even in Downing Street. I believe you think, because you have poured troops into India with a readiness and liberality that deserves all honour, that you have covered India, or at least all parts of it that are exposed to disturbance and disaffection, with soldiers. I wish it were so. Look at the map. (I have before told you that nothing Indian can be taken into the mind without the map.) Say that in round numbers 23,000 men have been landed in Calcutta since the end of May. Where are they? They are all, with quite insignificant exceptions, collected along the 200 miles of trunk road from Benares to Cawnpore, or within a few marches of it (this is ceasing to be true at this moment because the Commander-in-Chief is just moving up above Cawnpore, but that does not affect the case), and there are two regiments of the number near to Calcutta. In other words, Bengal and Behar with a population of forty millions do not possess a single European soldier more than they did when our troubles began. There are not much more than 3,000 Europeans, including rough bodies of sailors and undisciplined blackguards, to keep the peace in those two provinces. In Orissa there are not a hundred Europeans of any kind. It is true that Bengal proper is loyal and peaceable—Behar and Orissa less so. But it is the temper and the interest of the respectable classes which keep them quiet. The natives of Bengal are not warlike; but there are plenty in the population who are ready for gang robbery and murder; and every large town holds a discontented fanatical population, always ripe for mischief.

'A great part of Behar is a Sepoy country, and subject to special excitement just now. Orissa is much less important; but its people are in many parts savages—or nearly so—and there is at this moment what in ordinary times would be looked upon as a serious rising amongst them (at Sumbulpore and also at Palamow), though little is thought of it now. Over this vast area we are literally at the mercy of the natives, and the peace is kept mainly by the goodwill and exertions of the upper classes—the rajahs, zemindars, and native Government officials. It is no doubt to their interest to keep the country quiet; but they feel abuse of their race as keenly as other men, and some of them (especially in Behar) are not without temptation to take a line of their own, and to seize the opportunity of encroaching upon and oppressing their neighbours, until they see how the game goes with us. But even were it certain their interest

would keep them straight, it is surely wise to enlist their better feelings with us, and to get some extra and willing service from them, as in many many cases we have done.

'There will be little chance left of this if once the Queen's Government lends itself—intentionally or not—to the cry of the so-called British party; and this you would have done, especially if you had passed a rebuke upon the Governor-General for issuing those orders which, however much they may have been misrepresented here and misunderstood at home, are rightly appreciated by the intelligent classes of the Lower Provinces.

'But let us look further ahead—to the North-West and Central Provinces (the headquarters of the revolt), and to the time when peace shall be restored. What will be the position of Europeans in this part of India if an antagonism of race is encouraged now? Many indigo planters are seriously expecting that henceforth the Government will station a European regiment within easy call of every man's factory. This they consider essential to "Saxon domination," and no doubt it will be essential to their safety if the spirit which some of them are fomenting is allowed to extend itself.

'"Saxon domination" is an excellent thing if it means a large European army—plenty of European and no native artillery—no weak half-manned forts or arsenals—and every branch of the military establishments complete and ready; with a reduction of Native regular troops to the lowest possible scale. But if it means (as the crowd understand it) stringent laws for natives, and licence for Europeans—exclusion of natives from all places of trust and authority—and a general and avowed postponement of their interests to the interests of Europeans, the less we have of it the better. In neither case, however, will isolated Europeans find the provinces safely tenable—as heretofore—if that spirit makes head. People say: "Oh, a little violence must be expected. It doesn't matter. It is only a temporary heat, which will pass away when quiet is restored."

'I wish I could think so. I believe that unless we use our efforts to check the growth of this antagonism of dark skin and white skin, it will fix itself in India, where hitherto, to the credit of English common sense and feeling, it has been unknown. Patrick Grant talked with regret of the habit, a new one he said, of young officers speaking of their men as "niggers."[1] It is now a word in daily use

[1] A young officer in the army, who was talking after the manner of his kind contemptuously of the natives, happened, in Sir John Lawrence's hearing, to speak of them as 'those niggers.' 'I beg your pardon,' said Sir John, 'of what people were you speaking?' (*Life of Sir John Lawrence*, ii. 509.)

by every newspaper's correspondents. We have had bloody enmities with every tribe and race in India, but we have never yet treated them when vanquished with sweeping contempt and hatred. It will be a bad day for us when that word becomes naturalised in India.

'There is much more to be said on all this, but I have no time The moral to which I wish to come is, don't disapprove in a hurry.

'I have said that my case is stronger than appears in the despatches. They do not point out to notice (what was already before the Government in England when you sent for explanation) that of the commanders appointed to try and punish rebels in the Allahabad division, there was one who hanged every prisoner who came before him—a Dr. Irwin. I had myself been disposed at first to think that the private reports (such as are appended to the despatch of December 24) were exaggerated; but the sight of Dr. Irwin's return opened my eyes, and no time was lost in putting out the instructions. It is impossible anywhere, but above all in India, where false accusations and evidence are so rife, that any commissioner should have none but the guilty brought before him. Again, men were hanged for the pettiest offences. Articles of European clothing were sufficient to insure a man's conviction with some commissioners, although found in his possession at a time when, literally, the fields round Allahabad were strewn with such property. Two fugitives (ladies) who went home by the last mail actually clothed themselves in clothes which they picked up there, and put on in place of the rags in which they had escaped. Lady Canning knows one, or both, of these women.

'Again, I have in my possession a letter from an officer commanding a regiment of Irregular Cavalry, in which he announces his intention of condemning and hanging every sepoy whom he may find moving through his part of the country. I have reason to believe that he in some instances kept his word; but it will never be proved, for within a month of this announcement he was cut down and hacked to pieces by some of his own troopers, men who had assisted him in his execution of justice (?). His wife was murdered with him.'

LADY CANNING TO LORD GRANVILLE.

Christmas Eve, 1857.

'It was very brave of you to make that friendly speech on the unpopular side. I was also exceedingly glad of the good testimony borne by the Duke of Cambridge as to the cordial and friendly footing on which "Canning and Sir Colin" worked together. I felt sure

Sir Colin's letters must show this, and the Duke did an act of justice in setting the false report of the reverse at rest. I never can understand why it lasted so long. Lord Palmerston's good stout support has quite changed the tone of newspapers here, and they show it by impertinently pretending that the Governor-General has dropped his old policy and adopted theirs. So I suppose they intend in future to be more civil.

'Truth is not a flourishing plant anywhere just at present. "The highest lady in India" feels much inclined to call out Lord Shaftesbury.[1] What *can* he have said he *saw* in her letter? I certainly *heard* of one lady without nose and ears, but never *believed* in her existence, and can only have named it as a story I heard; and I certainly never wrote that such mutilated victims, and without eyes besides, arrived here day after day. But perhaps he knows of some "higher lady" than me.

'General Ashburnham goes by this steamer, and I do not much wonder, as there could not be a separate field command, and a division would not have been very tempting. He is so pleasant and amusing that we are very sorry to lose him so soon. I do not think he at all admires the Calcutta society, or will carry home a pleasing report of it. I hope he will tell you I am beautifying the Barrackpore garden. We had such a pleasant day there yesterday. Of his Staff one colonel is gone to Bombay, and the other impatiently waits for employment.

'I hope Sir Colin will very soon begin a new series of victories over that wicked Nawab of Futtighur, &c., and that the Nana may be caught when he clears out of the country harbouring him. The women and wounded are not yet arriving, for only one steamer has fetched any of them away, and the others keep sticking on sandbanks on their way up.

'There is great enthusiasm felt for these poor people, and some warm-hearted admirers propose meeting them with bands of music and volunteers and marching them to this house; another suggests a ball; another, shocked at the bad taste of such a proposal, says a public dinner at the Town Hall would be the right and kind thing—not a dinner to talk about them and drink their healths, but at which they should assist.

'We shall be thought cold-hearted and unsympathetic, I fear, for I can think of nothing but providing lodgings and clothing and advising friends to go quietly and bring the poor souls away as silently as possible. Some men have come and tell the strangest

[1] The attacks on Lord Canning had in some instances also been aimed at Lady Canning, who was spoken of under the above title by the writers.

stories of Lucknow. They still look worn and hungry. The sepoys inside, taunted and tempted by those across the street, and answering by inquiring after their own families and wanting to know who commanded their late comrades—an inquiry never answered—are some of the most curious histories. If those men had gone, the few English could never have held out, from sheer fatigue and scarcity of numbers. The plans showing the battling underground of mining and countermining are extraordinary. The leaves of the trees were all smoked away for want of tobacco; but even the despatches tell the whole story like the most romantic one ever heard.

'Do read the native addresses and the answers. They show that justice is valued, and I confess the intemperate one seems to be very true. Of course it makes the papers here frantic; they try and undervalue the signatures. But they do belong to real and important people, such as the first man as to family in Bengal: the Rajah of the Nuddea, a man not rich, and young, but of age, reported as a miser and impostor, but he is all I mention. The Burdwan Rajah, who pays half a million as rent, is the first signature of the other. I have nothing new to write, and have no idea what new stories are to replace those now contradicted.'

CALCUTTA, *January* 9, 1858.

'Lord Canning has got such a very bad headache that he has been prevented from finishing all his letters to-day, and a long one to Lord Palmerston is left unfinished for the post across to Bombay, which will not make much difference in time. He has been so very well all this cold weather that I was quite surprised this moment to find him quite knocked up, and the after packet is just starting. I do not know what he has left unsaid, but I do not think this has been an eventful week, and I do not think the unfinished letters will be of much importance. He sends you a satisfactory note from Cawnpore, which disproves the authenticity of an inscription at Cawnpore, which is printed in the *Overland Friend of India*, and which unexplained would give pain to many people.

'Many inquiries at Delhi, Agra, and other places have strangely knocked over hundreds of horrible stories everywhere repeated in newspapers.

'Sir Colin is at Futteyghur, and we believe will very soon deal with Oude, which is very important, as the natives look upon the abandonment of Lucknow as a sort of defeat.

'Sir Colin is not likely just now to catch the Nana or Nawab, as all fly before he can reach them to fight.

'The Nana is said to be still in Oude, certainly *not* at Najode, and going to Saugur to attack it, as the papers say.

'Poodle will be grieved at the death of Major Byng, killed in defeating the Chittagong mutineers.

'Canning is very sorry not to have written to Lord Palmerston to thank him for his hearty speech. It has been very useful here. Till it was made, every paper daily protested he was recalled, which is not a wholesome way of looking at the head of a Government.

'I must send this off. Canning began his day by writing to the Duke of Cambridge, and sending off some maps and the reprint of the Delhi despatches to the Queen, and I now find he has been quite knocked up with this sick headache for the last two hours.'

LORD GRANVILLE TO LORD CANNING.

SAVERNAKE, *January* 9, 1858

'I am sorry that the Palace at Delhi is to be destroyed, and I mean to complain of Vernon Smith writing to you, without ever consulting the Cabinet, or letting us know what he does. He has broken his collar-bone out hunting. I do not know what Ellenborough will say, for he complained to Lord Lansdowne of Vernon Smith being seen riding in Hyde Park during such a crisis.[1] We begin Cabinets again on Thursday next: the Indian measure will be our great topic. We have spent a pleasant week at Bowood, hunting, shooting, teaming, and smoking. The old Marquis older, but in good case again. He offered to resign the other day, but was easily persuaded to remain, although he says he is getting too old. I believe it was rather a flourish.

'We have received the telegraphic message announcing Havelock's death, which makes everybody melancholy, and the defeat of Windham. We are waiting for the details of his defeat, and the whole account of the operations at Lucknow, which will be most interesting, and which we hope will come by the mail.'

LONDON, *January* 24, 1858.

'I was on the point of writing to you by last Monday's mail, to acknowledge your and Lady Canning's most interesting letters of the 10th and 11th, when I got a telegraphic message announcing the death of my poor uncle, the Duke of Devonshire. I started directly

[1] Mr. Vernon Smith, then Lord Lyveden, told me in 1870 that he attributed his having been able to stand the strain of these events mainly to his habit of riding every day. He said he had once even ridden in the Park when it was dark; had passed Lord Ellenborough on his way home in St. James's Street, who recognised him and then went and told Lord Lansdowne that the Presiden of the Board of Control had evidently gone mad. He was hunting with the Pytchley as late as 1870. He died in 1873.—E. F.

for Castle Howard, where my mother was staying with her sister. It was broke to them before Georgy Fullerton and I arrived, and they were both much better than we had any right to expect. It was a great risk for Lady Carlisle, who has a heart complaint as well as a paralysed side. She has since been recovering her spirits. I am afraid my mother has been getting more depressed. They were both passionately fond of him, and to the last had something of a girl's affection for a much younger brother. I have felt the affliction very much. He was always very kind to me, and this went on increasing both towards Lady G. and myself to the end. It is a great comfort to us both to have paid him a long visit at Chatsworth, and to have been of use to him in several small ways this autumn. I believe you did not know him well, and he was not one of those whom you could have expected much to see again.

'I quite agree in your letter and the opinions you hold about the Government of India. The question about the natives will be argued by much abler men than me. Macaulay is prepared to speak on it. You reproach me with not telling you what I thought of your Missionary Subscription case. I thought it perfect, and, as you will have seen before the receipt of this letter, I made use of it with good effect in the House of Lords. Your late papers are admirable, and your answers to the lies delight me and all who read them. There still seems to be a run against you by the Low Church, I presume on account of Lady Canning's Church principles, but they will effect nothing. You may depend upon Lord Lansdowne being one of your warmest friends. It is doubtful whether he will ever speak much again. He offered his resignation the other day. Pam's speech, which I reckon you will acknowledge by to-day's mail, will have been the best answer. You say nothing about the Indian measure. I advise you strongly to hold your tongue about it, till you are officially asked your opinion, or till the matter is settled one way or other. Your plan is to go on in the same friendly way with the President and the Court. Lord Smith has broken his collar-bone, and it has made him look bilious and cross. It is said that Graham is to lead the attack against us. Sidney Herbert has written to explain away a conversation which was all for Indian Reform, and to say that it is inopportune, and that the sepoys will consider it a victory.

'*January* 26.—There is an article in to-day's *Times* abusing Pam's appointments in a strain which looks as if they thought he was not so strong. Lord John told his brother that he was appalled at the part which he should be obliged to play this session. Bethell thinks that by the middle of April, Lord Palmerston's Government will become "an historical fact." I believe all this sort of talk, like that

usually made in November, will be dissipated by Lady Pam's parties and the opening of Parliament. I have had your papers privately printed. Did I ever tell you that everybody praises your Lucknow Proclamation? I want Vernon Smith to print your late despatches before Parliament meets, but he thinks this cannot be done. I believe we shall carry the India Bill, but many of our combatants will be maimed in the attempt. The marriage, at which the Queen desired the Duchess of Sutherland and me to be present notwithstanding our mourning, went off well.[1] The papers will give you a description of it. It is melancholy starting off immediately after it, to go down for the ceremony at Chatsworth.'

LONDON, *February* 1, 1858.

'I never was more provoked than by having my last letter of a week ago returned to me by Vernon Smith, he having got it too late for the mail from the stupidity of his servant, who received it from mine. That letter explained why I did not write the week before, but the result is that you will receive none from me for two mails, which I regret, as you seem to like hearing from me, and I wished especially to thank you for your mass of papers, which are invaluable. It appears to me that your case is quite perfect, and I really believe will be generally felt to be more strong, from the previous lies and abuse.

'I have circulated rather largely your notes upon the lies, in confidence, among some friends, and one or two enemies. Ellenborough expresses great satisfaction at your being able to show that most of the things said against you were without information. We are going to propose a vote of thanks to you and to the army in India. This will, of course, give an opportunity for your detractors, which I hope will be availed of, as it will end in their signal discomfiture. I believe there will be a combination of parties for delay of our Indian Bill. Graham is supposed to be doubting whether he should or should not lead the attack. Your sister is admirable in cleverness, spirit, and courage.

'I saw Tom Ashburnham to-day. He gives a good account of you and Lady Canning, but says you take no exercise. This is bad economy of time. It will never do for your health to break down. The accounts from France are very bad, and our papers are irritating. A war with France would not surprise me. We are going to do something in strengthening the law for dealing with those who compass the murder of the Sovereign or subjects of foreign States.

'I am asked to Buckingham Palace this evening in order to wish the Princess "Frederick William" good-bye. She starts to-morrow.

[1] The marriage of the Princess Royal with the Crown Prince of Prussia.

The marriage has been very auspicious; everything has been done well, and the real popularity of the Queen has come out very strongly.'

LONDON, *February* 8, 1858.

'I have received another letter from you of an earlier date than the last. Nothing can be better than all you have written home. You will see by the tone of the newspapers that they think the reaction is as great as it was sure to be. I sent some papers to several persons to show them the real state of the facts.

'Lord Glenelg, who once wished for your recall, says that every shadow of a doubt about you has long been wiped out. Lord John says that there appear to be many more than the usual number of lies told about you; that you, however, are lucky in having friends who busy themselves to refute the calumnies, while his case is the reverse. Lord Aberdeen and Sidney Herbert are all you could wish. I know nothing about Newcastle.

'You are lucky that the difference now exists between the Government and the Court of Directors. Both will take care for different reasons to tell the truth about you. Do not for the future be so dreadfully afraid of committing Colin Campbell when he puffs you, and do not let Lady Canning hide her good deeds under a bushel. It won't do in this wicked world. Patrick Grant says you are one in a million; so think I.

'The Government is supposed to be shaky; the Liberals very angry with Pam. I send you the penultimate copy of the India Bill; I can't get the last. It is to be explained on Friday, and some changes have been and others may still be made The union of parties for delay is great. One question to be pressed home is whether you have been consulted.

'Shaftesbury has been obliged to eat dirt about Lady Canning's letter, and is much abused for his inaccuracy, and thirst for feeding the popular delusion whatever it may be. He deserves it.

'I believe the thanks to you will be opposed to-night in both Houses. I have crammed Grey and Lord Lansdowne. I do not mean to speak about you unless it is necessary. I think Pam knows his story, but he and indeed all of us are much occupied with the Refugee question.'[1]

BRUTON STREET, *February* 9, 1858.

'I beg to congratulate your Lordship on the successful issue of last night's debate. In the House of Lords, to do justice to Derby, he made the attack upon you as if it was against the grain. Malmesbury and Redesdale were away, and no one gave Derby a single cheer, excepting Hardwicke, who, as you know, is a gallant supporter

[1] See below, p. 292.

of a friend in distress. Argyll answered in the best speech I ever heard him make, right in tone, substance, and length. He carried the House completely with him, and most satisfactorily disposed of the whole attack. Grey was ready, but agreed to go away if Ellenborough would go. The latter seemed delighted to do so. I should have been better pleased if they had both remained. Poor Lord Lansdowne had given himself an attack of gout by preparing a speech which he was too ill to deliver. He was very much vexed, but was obliged to go away. He told me that he had particularly wished to say what he thought about your successful administration, and great merits in different ways.[1]

'In the House of Commons it began very ill. The cheers were very offensive, and Labouchere was heavy and had no business to put himself in Vernon's place, who knew the case much better. Walpole's speech turned the House, and after that it went on *crescendo* in your favour till the end. Pam told me this morning that he considered your triumph complete, and that nothing more flattering could have occurred to a public man.[2] You will forgive me when you see in some of the independent speeches traces of some of your private papers having been read. Old Glenelg wrote to me yesterday to say that he had had some doubts about you, that those doubts were entirely dissipated, and that he was heartily concurrent in any expression of thanks.

'Your reputation is now made. I shall be sorry for India, but glad for yourself and me if a temporary bilious attack obliges you to come back before the end of your time. You will then take your real place among the real swells, from which I sometimes thought your complete want of charlatanism might have kept you away.'

[1] The debate mentioned by Lord Granville was that on the motion for giving the thanks of Parliament to the civil and military officers and servants in India. Lord Derby took exception to the inclusion of Lord Canning's name.

[2] Lord Derby and Mr. Disraeli had both urged that the inhabitants of Calcutta had petitioned for Lord Canning's recall; that that petition was before the House, and that to give a vote of thanks with the petition unanswered looked like an attempt to screen him from future charges. Mr. Walpole, while accusing the Government of moving prematurely, said that to omit Lord Canning's name would be a practical decision on a side issue of the charges made against him, and would place him in an impossible position. He therefore urged Mr. Disraeli to withdraw his motion. Lord Palmerston subsequently declared that he would not consider the House bound by their vote to approve the whole of Lord Canning's general conduct and administration, which if necessary could be discussed at a future day. Mr. Disraeli then withdrew his amendment. Lord Palmerston's speech was greatly impaired by the loss on the way to the House of all his notes, on which he had entered the different services of the generals and civilians to be specially mentioned.

CHAPTER XI

LORD CANNING AND LORD ELLENBOROUGH

1858

'I CONGRATULATE your Lordship and Lady Canning,' Sir Colin Campbell wrote to the Governor-General in the last days of 1857, 'on the prospects of your great labours meeting with their reward in the gradual pacification of this country, and the rescue of it from the most terrible crisis by which the action of Government was ever paralysed in any part of the world. Few know as I do what these labours have been, and the unbending courage with which they have been prosecuted in the face of disasters over which for the time you had no control, and the exaggerated fears of the community surrounding you. England will receive with acclamation the great statesman who never faltered in the moment of direst peril, and whose ultimate triumph has been so rapid, so perfect, and so merciful, that history can hardly equal it.'[1]

The reputation of Lord Granville had been greatly increased by the speeches which he had made in defence of the policy pursued during the Mutiny by the Governor-General. In these speeches Sir Colin Campbell told Lady Canning that he 'recognised the note of the true chivalry of old,'[2] for they rang out clear and courageous at a time when others were ready to leave the absent in the lurch. 'Mine was, I believe, the first defence,' Lord Granville many years after these

[1] Sir Colin Campbell to Lord Canning, December 15, 1857. The concluding words were quoted by Lord Granville in the House of Lords on April 14, 1859. *Hansard*, cliii. 1714.

[2] Lady Canning to Lord Granville, March 27, 1857.

events reminded the Duke of Argyll, 'when I addressed the most hostile audience I ever remember. You defended Canning much better than I did; but I am not sure that you took a greater part in doing so. Palmerston defended him on the general principle of shielding public servants; but he was as nearly as much opposed to the "clemency" as Shaftesbury.'[1]

The congratulations of Sir Colin Campbell and those conveyed by Lord Granville in the letter with which the previous chapter concludes had barely reached the Governor-General, before the Administration, into the ranks of which Lord Granville was anticipating before long being able to welcome Lord Canning as a colleague, had ceased to exist. A variety of circumstances had suddenly combined to diminish the popularity of Lord Palmerston. Some thought that since his victory in the previous year he had become a trifle over-confident and jaunty. Lord Granville himself was of opinion that in any case it could not be denied that the immediate following of the Prime Minister showed an unnecessary bitterness towards those who had differed from them. Others, on the contrary, thought Lord Palmerston was showing signs of old age and want of energy. Several unpopular appointments had also been made: one in particular to a high office of State. There was consequently a considerable amount of latent discontent when Parliament met, which only needed some grievance around which to focus itself and become dangerous. The consequences of a grave event abroad furnished the pretext for a coalition against the Government which foes of various shades and different opinions had all been looking for; and before the month of February was over, Lord Palmerston and his colleagues had to resign owing to a vote on the Foreign Conspiracy to Murder Bill, February 20, 1858, which had been introduced in consequence of Orsini's attempt to assassinate the Emperor of the French on January 14, 1858. An excited public opinion in France was demanding the abolition of the right

[1] Lord Granville to the Duke of Argyll, February 19, 1887. *Hansard*, cxlviii. 64, 255.

of asylum in England, on the ground that the conspiracy to murder the Emperor had been organised there by political refugees, and that the laws of England gave inadequate protection to foreign sovereigns against such conspiracies. An equally excited public opinion in England regarded the proposals of the Government as an undue concession to the demands of a foreign Power, and Lord Clarendon was accused of having shown a want of public spirit in the manner in which he had received and answered the complaints of the French Government.

LORD GRANVILLE TO LORD CANNING.

LONDON, *February* 24, 1858.

'You will see by the newspapers that we have not been thinking as much as usual about you and India during the last three or four days. I believe that Milner Gibson's amendment on Friday was drawn up by Lord John, and was expected to do mischief by him, by the Radicals, and by some of the Peelites. It is supposed that no orders were given in the morning by Derby to his party, but being under the gallery, and seeing the effect of Milner Gibson's speech, he gave the word "Charge!" which was obeyed with fatal effect to the "late Ministry." It created great surprise and consternation, particularly after the large majority on the India Bill. We unanimously resolved to resign. Pam on Saturday took our resignations to the Queen, who after some objection and much civility accepted them. She asked Pam's advice as to his successor. He declined to give any, but laid before her Majesty the state of parties as regarded John Russell and Lord Derby. She sent for the latter. He laid before her the difficulties of his position, and begged her to reflect one night, before she gave him the commission. He went home, Lady Derby assures me, with the conviction that her Majesty would recall Palmerston. This, however, was not the case, and he undertook the duty of forming an Administration. He was refused by Lord Grey, by Newcastle, by Gladstone and the Peelites, by Pemberton Leigh, and by Walpole in the first instance. Lord Stanley would not join him. The list in the *Times* this morning is, I believe, accurate. The Cabinet is respectable enough, his supporters in the House of Commons under two hundred, but the Liberals very much divided. Gladstone would have joined, but did not like to go alone. You will have to decide what to do. It is not usual for a Governor-General to resign on a change of Ministry; but Derby and Dizzy have both acted with hostility to you,

yet leaving themselves plenty of room to get out. I have heard a great deal said in different quarters, including Aberdeen, Lansdowne, and Palmerston, as to the course which it would be best for you to take. I agree with Lord Aberdeen that it is undesirable that you should come back as if judged incompetent by one great party, who for the time had the confidence of the Queen. If they do recall you, which I believe is out of the question, you will be made an idol.

'In a note from Ellenborough, he tells me that he has written to you, so I suppose that he will in it have begged you to consider him as your attached friend. Remember also that this Ministry may be out in six weeks, and is very unlikely to last. I saw Aberdeen this morning on purpose, and he entirely agrees with me.'

BRUTON STREET, *March* 2, 1858.

'The papers will tell you all that is known about the new Government. Derby last night made his statement. He was feeble in utterance, and nervous, and his speech was too long, but his plan is judicious enough. After much consultation with Clarendon, Lord Lansdowne, and Palmerston, I assumed the post of leader of Opposition, and although some people have been complimentary, I was not at all satisfied with my starting speech. Clarendon made an excellent one, which if uttered in the House of Commons on Friday week would have saved the Government, at least for the time. There was a very bitter feeling against Pam on the part of Radicals, Peelites, Johnians, and ex-placemen. There was a reaction against his exaggerated popularity of last year. His manner too has lately been rather overbearing and dictatorial in the Commons.

'I still believe him to be more popular than Johnny, but the personal hatreds are so strong among the Liberal parties, that it is quite on the cards that this tolerably presentable Cabinet, with only 170 staunch suppporters in the House of Commons, may yet weather the storm.

'I hope you have seen how complimentary to you the *Examiner* and the *Economist* have become. People are anxious as to what you will do. The hot Whigs are all for your immediate resignation, but I hope you will take something of the line I suggested to you in my last letter. I suppose we shall hear from you at longer intervals.

'I am delighted with your departure from Calcutta.

'I forgot to tell you that Pam, in consulting me about the Garters which remained vacant on the morning of his resignation, said that he did not think that it would be an advantage to you if he gave you one at the moment of his fall, although, as he had before told me, he meant to keep one open for you if he remained in. I only regret this determination in the case of your resignation being accepted, or

your being recalled by the present Government. I believe the former improbable, and the latter out of the question. When once the matter has been settled, I should not wonder if you liked Ellenborough better than Vernon. The persons who have gained most by the late Administration are, *longo intervallo*, George Lewis, then in a minor degree Argyll, and last Benjamin the Magnificent, who has been a good Public Works.[1] The rest are about the same, excepting Vernon Smith, who is unjustly underrated.

'You will be surprised to hear that, placeman as I am, I am glad to be out.'

LONDON, *March* 10, 1858.

'I do not feel that I have much to tell you. There is a calm after the crisis of the last fortnight, and I am told that the French Government and our own have come to an agreement. What that agreement is I do not know.[2] It is impossible to predict what is likely to take place. The Derbyites have never yet mustered more than 170 votes; there are 380 Liberals in the House exclusive of Bright and Milner Gibson. Nothing of course but the divisions of the Liberal party can save the present Government. They are not, however, without hope in that respect. Palmerston is sanguine and thinks the Queen is certain to send for him whenever another break-up takes place. He has no objection to take in John Russell and the Peelites. But is there any chance of either joining? I think not.

'Johnny has taken his place on the lower bench just below the gangway, among the Radicals. Cardwell has gone behind the Opposition bench, where sit Pam and Co. Graham, Gladstone, and Sidney Herbert have not changed their places, wishing, it it said, to show that they will not join Palmerston, and that they are prepared to defend Derby from factious opposition; ready when the proper moment comes to join J. Russell in forming a Government. Will you bet that the first attack does not come from Gladstone or Graham? Altogether it is pleasant being out, but there are some personal difficulties. We mean to stick by Palmerston, who has done nothing to forfeit the confidence already shown by us. Lord John could not at present form a Government in the House of Lords. Clarendon, who has lost ground lately, is at daggers drawn with Lord John.[3] Dizzy's speech is a very impudent one in every way, and

[1] Sir Benjamin Hall, the first Chief Commissioner of Public Works to have the courage to ask for a grant of public money to adorn the public parks of London with gardens and flower-beds.

[2] The reference is to the questions involved in the amendment of the law of conspiracy, which had led to the fall of the late Government; and to the despatch of Count Walewski of March 20.

[3] Lord John Russell had said on March 15 that he believed Lord Malmesbury

must disgust those Conservatives who are not playing the political game. I am told that such persons are not pleased with the late move.

'I see that the *Times* assumes to-day that you will resign. I hope you will do no such thing, excepting in the way which may throw all the onus upon the Government. 'Yours, G.'

Lord Canning meanwhile, ignorant of the great events which had taken place in England, was continuing the narrative of his own anxieties.

LORD CANNING TO LORD GRANVILLE.

ALLAHABAD, *March* 16, 1858.

'Lucknow may be counted as disposed of. Here are the last three messages that have come in; and although Sir Colin speaks of there still being rebels in the city, it is clear that all combined resistance is at an end.[1]

'Sir Colin has done the job in his best and most workmanlike style. I have not yet got the list of casualties (I hope to have them in time for the mail), but it is certainly small, considering the numbers engaged, and the nature of the ground. Peel is wounded—called "severely," but only a flesh wound through the thigh. A young Thynne (son of Lord John's, I think), in the Rifle Brigade, is killed. Hodson, of "Hodson's Horse," a first-rate Irregular commander, is also dead of a wound. He is the man who arrested the King of Delhi, and promised life to some of the family. I hear that Layard, who is on his way home, picked up some ugly stories about these promises at Delhi. I do not know exactly to what effect, for he (Layard) spoke to me with an air of mystery and a good deal of devil in his eye, and always shut up when I came to particulars; but it is quite possible, from what I already know, that there was something *louche* in Hodson's transactions.

'I sent home by last mail a Proclamation which was to be issued to the Oude rebels as soon as Lucknow fell. Outram, who as Chief Commissioner of Oude would have the issuing of it, remonstrated against it as too severe—hopelessly so—and urged that not only complete pardon should be offered to all (except those concerned in

would carry on the affairs of the Foreign Office 'with great regard for the dignity and interests of England.' Lord Clarendon considered, but wrongly, that Lord John had intended to slight him by an implied comparison to his disadvantage. (*Life of Lord John Russell*, ii. 297.)

[1] After the relief of the Residency at Lucknow, the town was temporarily evacuated, and was then occupied by the rebels till March 19, 1858, when it was finally taken by Sir Colin Campbell, and then held.

murders), but that it should be declared that upon their coming in they should be secured in all their old possessions, i.e. not only those which they held when the mutinies broke out, but those which they held under the old Oude Government, and some of which they were compelled to disgorge when we took the country. In fact, that they should be so much the better for having rebelled; and this without waiting for any sign of submission on their part. I have flatly refused, but have added a sentence to the Proclamation which will make it clear that though confiscation of proprietary right in the soil is the general penalty, restitution of it is the reward for coming in and behaving well.

'I am not surprised at these counsels coming from Outram, who is kind and generous to weakness; but I have not yet recovered from my surprise at a letter which John Lawrence wrote to me the other day advocating an amnesty to the *mutineers* in Oude (*not* the rebels only), literally before a dozen of them have been brought to justice; for to kill them in equal fight is not doing justice upon them, and up to to-day we have been able to do no more in that province. I do not want more of general hanging and shooting—that may be reserved for special cases—but I do intend that large numbers of those men shall be transported—that the law shall be deliberately vindicated—and that those who remain shall understand that mutiny is not a game in which, if they get safely through the first hot scurry, they may reckon upon escaping scot free. The proposal has puzzled me even more than I can tell.[1]

'The dry heat here is quite different from anything that one feels in Bengal. I think I dislike it more, but I suspect it is wholesomer.

'The entire machinery of government has been broken up through these provinces, and I find the labour which this puts upon me (for I have assumed the Governorship of the North-West Provinces in addition to the Governor-General's work) rather more than I bargained or. But it is unavoidable. One of my reasons for coming was that I might judge on the spot how far the opinion, strongly held by some, that the occasion ought to be seized for replacing the elaborate systems (judicial especially) of the North-West by the simpler rule of thumb practice of the Punjab is sound; and I find, as might be expected, that the truth lies between the two extremes. The reconstructing process, if one had plenty of leisure to give to it, would be intensely interesting; and I have almost made up my mind to stay here through the hot season and rains.

'However, we are still some way from real peace. All Oude has to be reclaimed—most of Rohilcund—and Bundelcund is going to

[1] See *Life of Sir James Outram*, by Sir F. Goldsmid, ii. 334.

be more troublesome than I hoped. Rose, however, about whom I have had some misgiving, continues to do admirably.

'I am curious to see whether I shall be abused for calling in Jung Bahadoor. I should not wonder if it riled Ellenborough, but that won't make it wrong.

'Your last letter is as old as January 9, giving an account of Bowood and Savernake. It was pleasant to shut one's eyes and fancy one's self there. But do not think I am complaining. The last mail brought the account of the poor Duke of Devonshire's death, and I know how heavily that will have fallen upon you all.'

If Lord Granville's reputation had been increased by the events connected with the Indian Mutiny, the opposite it must be admitted, was the case with Lord Palmerston. Lord Clarendon's confidence in particular had been shaken by the apparent want of energy which he considered had been shown by the Prime Minister, and the doubtful support accorded by him to Lord Canning.

'We must do our utmost to prevent any veering about Cupido [he had written in the worst days of the Mutiny to Lord Granville], but I can't wonder at their feeling what I feel myself, and I own to being dreadfully disappointed at his want of energy and resource in this Indian crisis; at his hoping instead of acting; and at his determination to settle *how little* will do for present difficulties, instead of *how much* he can provide for coming emergencies. I have written to him very strongly, but in vain; and any departure from the beaten track seems to make him sick, as it did Colonel Sibthorp. He has got to talk of "the spirit of institutions" and what people would "like;" just as if the institutions and the people would not be too grateful for any exhibition of vigour in putting down the insurrection. The fact is, we are lagging behind the spirit which animates the country, and we shall deserve to be in the scrape we shall get into. . . .

'I am in active correspondence with the Premier [he went on a few days later, again writing to Lord Granville], and am endeavouring to pump wine into his water about India; but to no purpose. He is like *Monsieur le Docteur Pangloss, dans le meilleur des mondes possibles*; and is confident that we have done everything we could or ought, and that our power and prestige in India will be established to a rock before the natives have time to say Jack Robinson.'[1]

[1] Lord Clarendon to Lord Granville, September 21, 28, 1857. Cf. Martin's *Life of the Prince Consort*, iv. 91, 129.

With such feelings still warm within him, Lord Clarendon, when at the end of 1858 it was being discussed which of the two leaders, Lord Palmerston or Lord John Russell, should take the initiative in an attack on the new Bill for the Government of India which had just been introduced, preferred the latter as the lesser of two evils.[1]

'I have my doubts [he wrote to Lord Granville in March 1858] whether it would be a desirable thing that the "little man" should take the lead, as it will expose us to the charge of coalition, plots, &c.; *but I would greatly prefer him to Cupido*; and we must expect that some one will move the rejection; and he must be supported.'[2]

It was therefore determined to approach Lord John Russell; and these negotiations, though they at the moment had no result, paved the way for the joint action which eventually took place. The chosen emissary was Mr. George Byng, member for Middlesex.[3]

LORD GRANVILLE TO LORD CANNING.

BRUTON STREET, *April* 1, 1858.

'I ought perhaps to be more particular than ever in writing to you now, as you will like to know about the crisis. There is very little to tell you concerning yourself, excepting that there is great praise of you from everybody in conversation, and that there was a debate about ten days ago in the House of Commons in which nothing but *kudos* was given you, the speakers being all independent members. The new India Bill is a failure, and deservedly so. Hardwicke told me, before it was announced, that they had put plenty of cork in it to make it float, and Ellenborough told me that he had attended to little else, and that he must say he thought it an admirable Bill. It is a claptrap, and denounced as such by Palmerstonians, Peelites, Radicals, and Russellites. There is no chance of its passing in its present shape. We had a meeting two days ago at Pam's to consider what course we should take on the second reading. We were all agreed as to the Bill being detestable, but there was a difference of opinion as to whether we should oppose the second reading. Pam, G. Lewis, Vernon Smith, and Lord Cranworth were for opposing it. Lord Lansdowne, Clarendon,

[1] Lord Palmerston had introduced an India Bill a short time before his fall. Mr. Disraeli, Chancellor of the Exchequer, on March 26, introduced the India Bill (No. 2) in the House of Commons.

[2] Lord Clarendon to Lord Granville, March 30, 1858.

[3] Afterwards Lord Enfield.

Labouchere doubtful. I thought that we ought to consider whether we should have a majority, and whether that majority would not turn out the others too soon. We postponed any decision, but on my return home I found G. Byng, who brought a message from Lord John. The latter thought it necessary to oppose the Bill, and was inclined to move the rejection of the Bill, but would not commit himself till he knew what course the late Government would take. With Palmerston's sanction, I wrote to Byng that if Lord John made the motion, Palmerston and his late colleagues would warmly support him. Yesterday G. Lewis saw him, but he was still undecided. I am sure our danger is being too impatient. Pam has no time to wait. The opinion, which in this case is almost as serious as the fact, is rapidly growing, that he is no longer the same man. Johnny is impatient by nature. The Peelites have been wittily described as perpetually offering themselves for sale, and always buying themselves in. The Radicals are disunited among themselves. Their only able man, Bright, is incapable of real work. You will not, I think, have Vernon Smith as chief again. I shall be curious to know how you get on with Ellenborough. It is said that they have written neither one way nor another to you, but have assumed as a matter of course that there is no question of your coming away. This is perhaps best for them and for you. You can state your own views, and the time consumed in explanations will at all events enable you to see whether they themselves are likely to last. Ellenborough is much discredited already, and I am assured that the sore place is established in Derby's mind about his not being sufficiently consulted.'

SAVERNAKE, *April* 9, 1858.

'We came here on Monday, hunting with her Majesty's hounds on my way, a long run, leaving off twenty-three miles from the place where we started, and to which I wished to return. Poor Gipsey, whom you may remember, was hurt on her way from the station to the Street of Bruton. Lady G. has not been well, with cough and a little fever, but is now better ; the weather detestable. We go to town on Monday in order to resume parliamentary work. It is odd that opposition makes me more shy than being in Government. I am not, however, at all hungry for place at present. We are all keen about horse taming. If you had peeped through a hole in Bruce's Barn, you might two days ago have seen me sitting on a two-year-old, lying down with nothing but a snaffle bridle in her mouth, and a surcingle on her back.[1] It is still a secret, although,

[1] Mr. Rarey, the famous American trainer and horse tamer, was at this time in England.

now that hundreds know it, the secret will be that of the play. It is simple and ingenious. We received yesterday the telegraphic news which seems to announce that the town of Lucknow is as good as taken.[1] I hear that Russell did not think you civil to him, that you were very dry in your manner (which looks as if I should win my pound), while Sir Colin received him like a brother, had a tent pitched for him near his own, and admitted him to his mess. How right you were to insist on Lucknow being attacked! My former instinctive wish to consult you about everything is being justified. Nobody either in England or in India says one word now against your policy. You are now at liberty to take your own course; but I still advise you to be civil and communicate with all those—I imagine there are not many—who come in contact with you. I hear that Sir Colin is louder than ever in your praise. It is clear that, whatever course we take, the present Government will abandon the important parts of their new India Bill. Malmesbury has been making great changes in the Corps Diplomatique, much to the disgust of Normanby and Howden, whom with others he has recalled. The great question is the Persigny bracelet, which divides the fashionable world.[2] I do not know whether, in face of the active canvass, I shall be able to resist subscribing. There never was such an absurdity. I am still dying of curiosity to know what your course will be when you hear of the resignation of Ministers.'

The feeling which ultimately prevailed in Lord John Russell's mind proved to be that the government of India was too grave a question to be the mere battle-field of party; and on his suggestion it was agreed that the Bill should by consent be withdrawn and resolutions in Committee of the whole House passed to form the groundwork of a future measure. This course, though viewed with dislike by extreme partisans, was generally approved by public opinion, and the Bill transferring the Government of India, based on these resolutions, became law. Though the course thus pursued was eminently just and patriotic, the reasons for it were not known by the public, and the result only served to confirm the impression that divisions and jealousies still made the return of the Liberal party to power

[1] Sir Colin Campbell besieged and took Lucknow, March 14–19, 1858.

[2] This was a subscription to present a bracelet to Mme. de Persigny on the retirement from the French Embassy of her husband, who was about to be succeeded by Marshal Pélissier, Duc de Malakoff, as Ambassador.

difficult, if not impossible, and that Lord John Russell in particular had been animated by a desire to prevent united action.

Meanwhile the news of the change of Government had reached Lord Canning.

LORD CANNING TO LORD GRANVILLE.

ALLAHABAD, *April* 6, 1858.

'The change of Government has taken me aback with a vengeance. I never in my life was more surprised. A telegram from Bombay announced that you were all out, that Lord Derby was in; Lord Ellenborough at the India Board; and Parliament prorogued to March 12.

'The course which I have taken is this. I wrote to Lord Ellenborough by that mail explaining how much I knew, and that I considered it enough to act upon so far at least as to send him a short summary of the actual state of affairs; but adding that I left other matters, personal matters included, for another opportunity. This letter went four days ago. In it I avoided connecting myself with the future in India.

'Another opportunity has now arrived. A mail leaves this place for England to-day, and meanwhile the letters from England of March 2 have arrived here. But I have not received a single line from anyone connected with the new Government, nor any despatches. Your letter of March 2 is come, and I see by it that you have written by the preceding mail of February 24, but that mail cannot be here for a week. It has met with some unusual delay, having reached Madras only yesterday.

'Nevertheless I must write to Lord Ellenborough, and this time it cannot be a waiting letter as before. My mind is quite clear as to what I ought to do, and though I put myself at some disadvantage in taking the initiative, and make misinterpretation much easier, I think it is the plain and straight course to say to the new Government at once how I view my own position. Accordingly I write to-day stating that as regards information I am just where I was, having heard nothing from him or from anyone connected with the Government, but that I do not on that account wish to shut myself up in silence; and that he has a right to know at the earliest moment how I view my position, so far at least as regards the question of resigning or retaining my office.

'I say then at once that it is not my intention to resign the Government of India unless I shall receive from the Queen's Government a direct intimation that this is desired by them. I do

not suppose the case in which, without receiving any such intimation, I should find Indian affairs so dealt with by the Government at home as to indicate a want of confidence in my administration, because I feel sure that against this I am safe in your hands. I will not enter into a profession of the motives which have guided me to this decision. It is enough to say that I believe that I best discharge my public duty by so acting.

'This is what I have said—I shall be very curious to see whether it at all accords with your coming letter. Whatever you may think of it, I have dissected my feelings pretty closely, and I believe I can say that not one grain of selfishness has entered into the decision—excepting that I shall be glad to avoid all suspicion of desiring to run away from the difficulties which surround me. In every other respect my yearnings are in the opposite direction, and so strong that I am obliged to keep them out of my mind. The "hot Whigs" of whom you speak, and many others, are pretty sure to hear of what I have done with a sneer; but I don't care a straw for that, if only those I care for will do me justice.

'The last twelve months have made me a moral rhinoceros as regards the world at large.

'I shall be glad if you will let Lord Palmerston know what course I have taken. I can never be sufficiently grateful to him for his most gallant and friendly support, and I would not for anything have him think that I am forgetful of it. I will write to him as soon as the letters which the mail of February 24 must bring from Ellenborough or Derby show me how I stand. Strictly speaking, I suppose I ought not to have given you my own letter to Ellenborough; but you will not abuse the indiscretion. God bless you, my dear friend.'

Lord Granville never made a greater miscalculation than when he told Lord Canning that, after a little experience, he might possibly end by preferring Lord Ellenborough to Mr. Vernon Smith as his official chief. Lord Ellenborough had not been in office more than a few weeks before he brought himself into violent collision with the Governor-General by the publication in a despatch of an unmerited censure couched in trenchant language, and issued to the public without the knowledge even of his own colleagues of the contents. How the censure recoiled on the author of it; how Lord Ellenborough only escaped involving the Government in his own discomfiture by a hurried

resignation; how the attack made in consequence on the Government ended nevertheless in the discomfiture of the Opposition; and how nearly everybody concerned, except the Governor-General, came out of the affair with plumes more or less battered, forms one of the strangest episodes in modern Parliamentary history. Some account of it will be found in the following letters.[1]

LORD GRANVILLE TO LORD CANNING.

LONDON, *April* 25, 1858.

'I have received your letter of March 16, and I congratulate you warmly on your successes at Lucknow. Sir Colin seems to deserve all the praise which he is now getting. What were we about when we preferred Simpson and Codrington to him in the Crimea?

'Your message about Sir William Peel enabled me to make a reconciliation with his brother, who has cut me since he described my speech about you as dull as ditchwater. I have not seen Layard. Ellenborough does not approve of your Proclamation as sent home, but he has not yet seen the paragraph which you added after the correspondence with Outram.[2] The latter's proposal seems ridiculous, but I think you must take care to give ample room for submission. Vernon Smith made a very spirited attack on the Government for their attacks upon you when they were in opposition. You will see that the House was much amused when Pakington informed them that his onslaught on you was "hypothetical." I have seen nothing but praise of you in any of the periodicals which I have lately read.

'Vernon Smith is in a great state of excitement, furious with his late colleagues for judiciously avoiding what would be deemed factious movements. He was foolish enough to threaten yesterday when we had *quasi* Cabinet at Palmerston's that he should take separate action. He cannot know that if Pam is recalled to office, the probability is that he will not go back to the India Board.

[1] The general outline of the story is contained in Martin's *Life of the Prince Consort*, iv. 221–232.

[2] The Proclamation confiscated the proprietary right in the soil held by the talookdars of Oudh, with six exceptions, but promised indulgence to those who made immediate surrender and submission. Sir James Outram considered the terms too severe, and Lord Canning consented to add a clause promising that such indulgence should be largely interpreted and should include restitution. The Proclamation was published afresh with the new clause added, and the copies of the old edition were destroyed. But the latter alone had at this moment reached England. The text of these documents will be found in the *Annual Register* for 1858, pp. 251–253. See also *James Outram*, by Sir F. J. Goldsmid, ii. 335.

'Johnny by putting himself too forward has got into scrapes.

'I see nothing to turn out the Government this year, but the revulsion of feeling is amusing. A month ago we were threatened with severe penalties if we did anything to disturb the present Government. We are now told that the Party will at once choose other leaders if we do not lead them into action.

'The East India Company are in great hopes that, with the assistance of the Peelites and by the force of circumstances, they will be able to escape all legislation this year. Ellenborough has reduced the elective principle to such an absurdity, that the current of opinion is now running against any Council at all. I have always been for this course, but a short time ago it would have been madness to propose it.

'I can quite understand the interest you feel in the Government of the North-Western Province, but, begging your pardon, nothing can be more absurd than you continuing to administer it. Ellenborough says, and I believe him, that it is quite beyond the strength of any man. You should devise means to save yourself work instead of accumulating it.

'I have to prepare a speech about India to-night, on a motion of Albemarle, which opportunity will prevent Argyll from bursting. I have no doubt that he will make a capital speech, but his impatience to get it out has been amusing—abusing the Opposition for not seizing an occasion to discuss India, and equally surprised that Ellenborough should show apathy when he ought to court discussion. He has a great charm from being with his great ability so perfectly simple-minded.

'I am very shy in opposition, and altogether in a lazy state of mind.'

16 Bruton Street, London, W., *May* 10, 1858.

'Although I have been thinking and dreaming of you ever since Friday afternoon at five o'clock, I have at last only a few moments to write to you. You will know the principal facts from the papers; I will only add commentaries on some points. The answer of Dizzy was cheered only by a few people round Bright. Ellenborough was put out at Dizzy's answer that afternoon. In the debate in the Lords the cheering on our side was louder and more unanimous than I ever remember. My speech is reported all wrong from beginning to end. Grey was excellent. Derby in the afternoon had a regular wigging from the Queen, who suggested leaving out a portion of the despatch. Dizzy either intentionally or unintentionally forgot to have his despatch amended. Read your *Times* of to-day; and remember that it is at this moment the chorus of public opinion as

to your character as Governor-General. It is fair to say that there is much difference about the Proclamation. The Indians, with some exceptions, say it is quite right, and is sure to be successful. Sensible people say it is impossible to pronounce an opinion at first sight; to a large number confiscation sounds ugly. This will all be put right by debate. The City is in a state of frenzy, the Directors ditto. All the Government people say it is a very bad case. Derby told Clarendon at the Palace on Friday night, "We have been beaten horse and foot." They still hope for a popular cry against annexation. Shaftesbury goes raving about the town: he says you have been treated as no man ever was. He is much more violent for you than he was against you. He entirely forgets what he did in the autumn. It was settled yesterday that Palmerston in the Commons and I in the Lords should move a motion of regret and alarm at the publication of the despatch, tending to weaken your authority, and increasing the difficulty of governing India at this moment. I was all for independent members; and Cardwell or Sidney Herbert will do it on Thursday next in the Commons, Shaftesbury in the House of Lords, thus probably dividing on the same night.

'We shall have a majority of a hundred in the Commons, and be beaten by seven or eight in the Lords. Everybody, Peelites (I don't know about Gladstone), Russellites, Grey, Somersets, F. Baring, Monteagle, every shade but Bright and a *few* Radicals with the Government will be on your side. This is an important element in your decision as to coming away. At first I thought it impossible for you to remain. I am no longer of that opinion. Grey wrote me an excellent and characteristic note; Shaftesbury, Lord Aberdeen, Sidney Herbert, Palmerston, John Russell, take Grey's view. The Shelburnes are a little doubtful, but have written. Clanricarde is for resignation; Lord Lansdowne ditto; G. Lewis inclined that way; the last three speaking without reference to the vote of want of confidence. My advice is this. Of course, if you have not resigned three weeks ago, do not resign now till you know the result of the vote. Putting this aside, I should in your case be guided partly by what I thought my health would stand, and by what you really believe to be important to the public interest. You need not consider the point of honour in this case. Of course you will know long ere this the effect of your Proclamation. If it is successful, it does not much signify to you what course you take.

'If I was not so angry with him, I could almost pity the poor Peacock.[1] He is so miserably crestfallen. I never was so pleased about

[1] Lord Ellenborough.

your position. By the folly of your chiefs, you have been admitted at once in public opinion to the rank of one of the greatest Indian Governors. God bless you.'

16 Bruton Street, London, W., *May* 17, 1858.

'Your conduct on the resignation of the Ministry is excellent, and puts you upon velvet as regards subsequent events. Your last mail must have been the most exciting one any man ever received. I am only afraid that you will have no one with you to whom you can talk it over confidentially and fully. I suppose there is no chance of your reading it according to dates, which will spoil the interest of the story. It was a pleasure telegraphing to the Marseilles Consul that he was to inform you of the resignation of the Peacock.[1] (Ben Stanley stopped a little girl in the street the other day to ask her whether Ellenborough had given her the feather in her hat.) I wonder what you will think of the parliamentary move. There could be no doubt about it in the first instance. There would have been a majority in the House of Commons of eighty, and in the Lords, as it turns out, of twenty. The move in the Lords was criticised by some, and when Ellenborough resigned many were against its being made, but we could think of no reason to give for withdrawing which would not weaken our friends in the Commons. Everybody now thinks we have had a triumph. Shaftesbury's speech was magnificent, Grey's excellent, Argyll indifferent, mine bad, but I had the presence of mind to raise a loud cheer, taken up by our friends, when the large minority was announced.[2]

'Derby's was a clever speech. Lyndhurst thought Ellenborough's very moderate. Thesiger was very poor. Cairns made against you in the House of Commons one of the best speeches ever heard there, but luckily Johnny ended by one of his great performances.

'Lord Aberdeen's conduct in abstaining from the division will annoy you. It converted our majority into a minority. It was inconsistent, and only in consequence of his being under the force of a more powerful and youthful mind and intellect. Gladstone is in one of his states of morbid excitement, which must some day have a fatal effect on him, and he bullies his colleagues fearfully. Lord Aberdeen told me two days before, that the only thing which he cared about in politics was your position, so that you must not

[1] Lord Ellenborough resigned in May 1858, and was succeeded by Lord Stanley.

[2] Lord Shaftesbury's resolution in the House of Lords condemning the Government was defeated by only nine votes. Lord Ellenborough had already resigned in order to relieve his colleagues of the odium which the violent language and premature publication of the despatch had caused.

imagine that it is lukewarmness about you, but hatred of Palmerston, &c. &c. which has made him take this course.

'The Tories talk big about having a majority in the Commons. I believe that we cannot have less than thirty-five, probably between forty and fifty. I believe that they will dissolve. How short-sighted we were last autumn to mind the abuse poured upon you for clemency! It has been the making of you. Roebuck at a meeting of the extreme Radicals told them that your policy had always been a truculent one. They laughed him down.'

May 24, 1858.

'I had a great deal to tell you about politics, but I now feel rather confused about them. Although the Peelites probably think me a violent party man, and dying to come back to office, it is not the case. For several reasons I am glad that we are not called upon just now to form the Government. For a young man, I have been so long in office that I am not sorry to go through a sufficient quarantine before coming in again. The reconstruction of the Government would have been painful on personal grounds, and I doubt our having made a very strong Government after all. I like my liberty, and you know that my aversion to idleness is not great. Notwithstanding all this, one gets excited in a fight, and I felt my tail between my legs when, having been in the country all Friday, I came into the House of Commons just in time to hear Pam advise Cardwell to withdraw his motion.[1] We cut rather a foolish figure. I believe that a hundred Radicals agreed at the last moment that they must do everything to prevent a dissolution. You stand on firm ground. How lucky the abuse of you in the autumn has turned out, and how fortunate for you this last explosion, which has made tangible the complete reaction which I knew, but which I could not prove, had taken place about you.

'The debate and division in the House of Lords was a success, odd as it may seem, but it is so accepted; the small majority, the

[1] The Government were saved from defeat by the arrival of the mail from India bringing the despatches showing that Sir James Outram had disapproved some parts of the Proclamation. It had also to be admitted that a letter from Lord Canning to Mr. Vernon Smith, dated February 20, informing him that he did not wish the Proclamation given to the public until the explanatory despatch to Sir James Outram could be published also, had not been shown by Mr. Vernon Smith to Lord Ellenborough, his successor. This created a considerable impression, although Lord Palmerston showed and Lord Ellenborough admitted that practically the same information had been given to him by Lord Granville, who had communicated to Lord Ellenborough the substance of Lord Canning's letter of March 16 printed above.

tone about you, and the Ministry only daring to move the previous question.

'I was at first against moving the matter after Ellenborough had resigned; but when Hayter promised a majority of fifty, I thought that there was no doubt, and if the House of Commons went on, it was right that the Lords should do the same. I have had a correspondence with Aberdeen, which if I was in town I would send you. I believe that he and Gladstone thought your position secure, and were determined at all price to prevent Palmerston forming another Government.

'Gladstone spoke admirably about you on Friday. Graham, in my opinion, behaved disgracefully. A short time before, in the presence of Sidney Herbert, he in the strongest language denounced the Government, but said that there were four questions to be considered: (1) Whether we should have a majority. (2) Whether in that case Derby would dissolve. (3) Whether he would gain by a dissolution. (4) Whether a strong Liberal Government could be formed. All legitimate questions for him to ask. He ended by saying that the times were alarming and critical, and that he did not commit himself as to what line he should take. To my surprise, I read that Graham defended the Government; and after talking as if he was the organ of Lord Aberdeen, whose affection for you was of a parental character, he raised every point which could damage you most. Luckily the opinion of the whole House as regards you was most unequivocally shown when the next day a unanimous cheer was raised at Dizzy's announcement that the Government had telegraphed to you the promise of their support.

'You must be in a puzzle. I am inclined to expect that you will have resigned (which was not necessary but natural) when you received the secret despatch; that a fortnight after you will have got that extraordinary budget of news, the publication of the despatch, the notices of motions of censure, the resignation of Ellenborough, the vote of confidence of the Directors, the promise of support from Derby. You will, I imagine, do nothing upon this, but wait till the next mail, when you will find that the Government have been practically victorious in both Houses, but that everybody is in your favour, and of opinion that you must remain. The case will be clearer to you than it is now to us, as you will know whether your Proclamation has been successful, and whether the whole thing is at an end.

'I cannot help feeling a pang at giving up the hopes of seeing you again soon, but for Heaven's sake take more care of your health. Independently of other considerations, the glory of your Govern-

ment will not be increased by your coming away prematurely with a bad stomach and liver. You must work a little less, and take more exercise.'

BRUTON STREET, *June* 25, 1858.

'Although by habit I have dated from Bruton Street, I am writing from the House, instead of listening to an eloquent Indian speech from Albemarle. The air from the Thames is pestilential, and must soon put an end to the session. There are questions as to moving the seat of the Legislature to St. James's Palace and Marlborough House.

'Stanley introduced the second reading of the third Bill for India last night.[1] I am told that he did it well. Bright made a remarkable speech, more than I thought his brain would have allowed.[2] He omitted the question before the House, but went into the whole subject of India. His plan is to divide the Indian Empire into so many distinct Presidencies. I believe that the Bill in some shape or other will be passed. Nothing can be more gloomy than the prospects of the Liberal party. Palmerston has lost all influence in the House of Commons and all his popularity in the country. I have no doubt that there will be a second reaction in his favour, if he maintains his health and strength, but he is seventy-four. Johnny has not profited in the least by the descent of his rival. Clarendon is not popular; no more is Newcastle. Grey is the most important man on our side of the House, and stands high for character and independence, but the Liberals do not like him. The Peelites are still further disjointed and unpopular, and above all there is no cohesion amongst the Liberals. Society goes on much as usual, with rather more than the average proportion of flirtation. . . . There was a magnificent ball at Apsley House last night, and the annual concert at Lansdowne House.'

July 10, 1858.

'It is flat writing to you till we know the effect produced on you by the famous secret despatch, and by the still more extraordinary accumulation of news interesting to yourself which you will receive in the subsequent fortnight. Moreover, there is nothing very pleasant in politics to chronicle, particularly if the chronicler happens to have belonged to the late Government.

'All that I said in my last letter about the leaders of the Liberal

[1] The India Bill (No. 3), founded on the resolutions which had been adopted, had now been introduced.

[2] Mr. Bright was unwell at the time, and dreaded the effort of having to speak in public.

party may be repeated more strongly now. Both are determined not to give way—neither of them can be put aside. Pam has been acting in accordance with the advice of Vernon Smith, against the advice of G. Grey, G. Lewis, C. Wood, and Labouchere, and has suffered accordingly. Johnny has not in the least bettered himself. I believe in the country there is still a feeling for Palmerston; none for Lord John. On the other hand, the conduct of the Government is justly appreciated everywhere. At Court they are detested; they are abused by Peelites; their Radical supporters sneer at them. They certainly quarrel among themselves, but the upshot is that they are infinitely stronger than they were two months ago, and that time-servers judiciously think that there is no better game than to support them.

'You will be glad for me in these circumstances that I am getting to like opposition. Although I have not made one good speech this year, I am accepted as leader, and I never knew our side of the House so cordial and united. Although Grey constantly attacks us and takes lines of his own, he is most friendly, delights in being consulted, and sits in the midst of us, ditto the Duke of Somerset, who to my great astonishment made an admirable speech the other night on Church Rates. Lord Aberdeen is much broken. Newcastle is quiet, prosier than ever, both in public and private, but considered by many good judges as likely to play a great part in coming events. Frank Waldegrave is the great political woman of the day, and intends to make Newcastle Prime Minister.[1] In the meanwhile she accepts as admirers Clarendon and (you will be astonished) Grey. Argyll is ending a course of Carlsbad. We shall miss him in the debates next week on the India Bill, which will now pass. You must rather regret the Company, who have been good friends to you.'

Lord Canning to Lord Granville.

Allahabad, *July* 20, 1858.

'My dear Granville,—I heard with great sorrow of your poor brother's terrible loss. With such a store of happiness as seemed to lie before him, it is hard indeed to see it all cut off suddenly.[2] I hardly know what future to imagine for him. I wish he were in

[1] Miss Frances Braham married, first, Mr. John James Waldegrave, of Navestock in Essex, in 1839; secondly, the seventh Earl Waldegrave, in 1840; thirdly, Mr. George Granville Harcourt, of Nuneham; and fourthly, in January 1863, the Hon. Chichester Fortescue, afterwards Lord Carlingford. A gipsy was said to have prophesied that she would be married four times.

[2] The allusion is to the death of Lady Margaret Leveson-Gower.

Parliament again. That, and the near approach to a home of his own which you can make for him, would be some make-weight; but it is a sad prospect at best.

'It is now just two years and eight months since we parted; and although none of the events upon which we morbidly speculated have happened, others quite as melancholy and much more startling have come in their place. I wonder what remains in store before we meet again?—but it does one no good to think of this.

'I have not written since these last convulsions in Parliament. I will begin at the beginning.

'The secret despatch arrived about June 1. I had just been knocked down by a sharpish fever, and was turning the corner when it was brought to me. I really cared very little about it; though the totally inoffensive tone of the Elephant's private letters had in no way prepared me for such a missive. My first and immediate impulse was to d——n his impudence, and throw the despatch aside to be answered at leisure. Indeed, I rather looked forward with satisfaction to doing this, for it would not have been difficult to give a stinging but perfectly civil reply (or a doubly insolent one, *à volonté*); and as I was determined not to alter my course of action a hair's breadth in consequence, time did not press. Of course I did not dream of the publication of the despatch.

'For ten days I was rather shaky, and not fit for real work, and before that time an obscure telegram arrived saying that a despatch about Oude had been published in London, which had made a great sensation. It was some days before I was quite sure that this was *the* despatch; and when the certainty of this arrived in a clearer telegram, it altered things very materially. I now, for the first time, thought seriously of resigning; but after a little consideration dismissed the idea, though not without a pang. The question, put shortly, seems to be this.

'The Government at home have shown themselves eager not only to blame me, but to discredit me publicly. I have no means of setting myself right in India except by an answer passing through England. If I retain the Government, either temporarily till a successor arrives, or with a view to defending my policy against misrepresentation and demanding a judgment upon it, I shall have to carry on the Government for at least three months with weakened hands and disparaged authority. This will be irksome and distasteful to myself, and unsafe for the country.

'*Ergo*, I ought to resign at once.

'*Per contra*—

'The Government have hastily and unjustly condemned a policy which is doing as much for the pacification of Oude as any policy,

short of an overwhelming force, could do. They have also held language as regards our rights over Oude which, if the Government of India accepts it silently, and does not exact a recantation of it, will lay up incalculable difficulties not only in the way of pacifying Oude, but in keeping it peaceful hereafter.[1]

'If I resign, and a provisional Governor-General takes my place, he cannot do otherwise than obey the despatch and attempt to "mitigate" my policy in Oude; which now that we are short of troops there will be infallibly taken for weakness and encourage resistance; whilst my resignation will be taken as stamping and sealing the general doctrines in regard to Oude which the Government has put forth.

'*Ergo*, I ought not to resign.

'I ought to set aside the despatch from beginning to end, so far as action upon it is concerned, and pursue my own course. I ought to answer it, pointing out the mischief of the general doctrines regarding Oude, and vindicating my own policy; and if the judgment which the Government pass upon that policy is unfavourable, or if for any other reason confidence is not openly declared in me, demanding to be relieved.

'I soon determined to give my vote on this last side, and to answer accordingly.

'Upon this arrived the mail—your letters and many others. By the greatest good luck (as concerns dramatic interest) the last two covers which I opened were from the Consul at Marseilles, announcing in telegraphs from you and from Malmesbury the resignation of the Elephant. The tenor of the letters was not uniform; but upon the whole they confirmed me in my decision, as of course did the fate of the Elephant.

'My despatch (June 17) will probably have been printed before this reaches you—it should arrive in London at the end of this or the beginning of next month.

'Then as regards Parliament. It astonished me a good deal to find how you had all been fighting over my body. As a party move I do not think it can have been a carefully weighed one, for surely the horror of a dissolution might have been ascertainable from the first; but as regards myself I have good reason indeed to be thankful. The many friendly letters that I have had, and the generous tone of those who spoke in my behalf, have filled my heart very full,

[1] Besides censuring Lord Canning, Lord Ellenborough's despatch gratuitously impugned the English title to supremacy in Oude. This mistake was the subject of an eloquent passage in Lord John Russell's speech on May 10 above alluded to. (See *Life of the Prince Consort*, iv. 228–230.)

and have given me new life and spirits just as I was beginning to want them. You cannot believe how refreshing it is in this baking hole, and without a genial soul to whom to unbosom one's self—except fine old Sir Colin—to get a cheer of encouragement from home.

'I read a part of one of your letters to Sir Colin the other day. He said, "I like to see Lord Granville's speeches in the newspaper—there is always something chivalrous in them." Another day when I gave him a bit of a letter from the Viscount, with an account of a debate, to read, I asked whether he knew Lord Sydney? "No, but I think I know him by sight. Isn't he that handsome man who married Lord Anglesey's daughter?" Pray mention this in the proper quarter, for it will be very pleasant to meet Sir Colin in future days at Frognal.

'Some months ago I offered a reward of a lac of rupees—10,000*l.*—for the capture of the Nana. I hear he has offered two lacs for my head. There is something complimentary in his impudence, and, upon the whole, I prefer it to Ellenborough's.

'I wonder where this will find you. If with Lady Granville, give her my very best love. I would give a great deal to hear a *roulade* come from the verandah.

'Don't leave off writing, *pray*.

'Lady Canning is in Calcutta, immensely better for the Hills. She will be here in about three weeks.

'I forgot, at the end of my narrative, to say that I have had one letter from Derby and one from Stanley. The first longish—very civil and kind, and assuring of support, but making a case on his own side, in an uncontentious way. The latter very short—announcing his accession; but in *excellent* form and tone, and very civilly. A very good and becoming letter.

'God bless you, my dear friend.'

LADY CANNING TO LORD GRANVILLE.

ALLAHABAD, *October* 5, 1858.

'I am charged by Canning to thank you for your last two letters, which arrived together a mail ago, and he tells me to assure you that his constant neglect of answering your letters troubles him very much, and almost spoils the pleasure of receiving them, but it does not arise from weak health. He is always so hardworked, and the pressure redoubles so invariably within a day or two of the departure of the mail, that he can barely get through his business, and in the short evening after dinner cannot attempt taking to pen and ink again, he is so knocked up.

'The Queen's Proclamation is due, we suppose, by the Bombay

mail. There is great impatience for it here, and we are puzzling over all sorts of ideas for putting it forth with due pomp. You cannot think how difficult it is.[1]

'We can have fireworks by night and royal salutes by day, a dinner of course, and troops paraded; but we can make little show in this burnt station. I doubt if we can get a bit of bunting even for flags. I think Canning must read the Proclamation himself, and we are busy planning how, when, and where, and to what audience.

'It would amuse you to help us in our private consultations on these weighty matters.

'I hope it will come soon, before Lord Clyde is away to Oude with the best part of our troops.

'Lord Clyde at last allows himself to be so called; but it was no easy matter to get him to bear it meekly, and he put it off again and again till at last after his Staff had been snubbed many times it was published in a General Order, and he had to resign himself.

'I believe the reoccupation of Oude will begin very soon, and from the very little attempt at fighting there has been in any late encounter one must hope it will be easy; but nevertheless it takes an enormous quantity of troops to hold the country securely, and to protect the well-disposed, till the whole country is subdued and pacified.

'Sir Hope Grant has just returned to his camp at Suttempore, and set off to ride sixty miles across Oude with only his aide-de-camp Augustus Anson and six native horsemen.

'I hope matters will be quiet enough for Canning to march into Oude too, later, and I am very much in hopes of going too, I think, by way of showing how well inclined we are, and how confident in the restoration of peace. I shall rather do good by my presence than be an incumbrance. I am making great use of this line of argument—such a tour would be very delightful.

'Canning still has the work of the North-West Government on his hands. There is so much to be done that all his best men have their hands full, and any change seems more difficult to effect than ever. I hope he will get rid of this extra labour before long, for it is very wearing, and another man might do it.'

Lord Granville to Lord Canning.

February 9, 1859.

'When at Bologna, I sent you copies of a long correspondence between Sir John Lawrence and myself. I sent them in two packets.

[1] The Proclamation bringing India under the direct government of the Crown is here alluded to.

You probably never received them. I have got an answer from him, to whom I wrote at the same time. He writes civilly, says that my note shows that I was actuated by no unfriendly feeling, and requests me to make an explanation in Parliament, which I have done, and which leaves matters very much as they were. I mean to avoid saying anything in Parliament placing myself as your friend in hostility to the Government.[1] Otherwise there are several questions which I should like to ask them. I congratulate you on the G.C.B. and the promised step in the peerage. I grudge them having the honour of doing for you that which, if they had delayed, public opinion would have forced upon them. You stand upon a pinnacle here, and I hear your popularity in India is now universal.'

March 19, 1859.

'My doubts about moving, respecting Stanley's letter of December 9 to you, were solved by Clanricarde telling me on Thursday evening that he had given notice of a motion bearing upon it for the next evening. I saw Johnny yesterday morning, and Palmerston, and told them the facts of the case, which I believe are as follows. *In October* the Committee of Council drafted a reply to you, to which naturally enough Stanley objected.[2] He then drafted an offensive despatch, which he showed to the Committee of Council, not an official act. They told him that neither they nor the Council would agree to it. It subsequently was approved by the Cabinet, and much corrected by the Queen, and sent to you on December 9 without being submitted to the Council, who have been loudly proclaiming, ever since, their non-participation in and disapproval of it.

'In the House of Lords, Clanricarde did it tolerably well, but too lengthily. Derby spoke as he alone can speak on a subject about which he appeared to know nothing. He was hard at work studying a memorandum all the time Clanricarde was speaking, and when I suggested that the despatch had not been approved by the Council, he rushed down to the Throne to inquire from Sir G. Clerk whether this was the case. Hardwicke was at sea, so much so that Grey would not follow him. Ellenborough was weak. The feeling

[1] Lord Granville had contrasted the recognition of the services of Sir John Lawrence by the Government with their neglect of those of Lord Canning.

[2] The Indian Council had just come into existence under the Government of India Act. The despatch referred to, dated December 9, 1858, was a reply to a despatch of Lord Canning, dated June 17, in which he had explained and defended the grounds on which he had acted in issuing the Oude Proclamation. Lord Palmerston described the tone of Lord Stanley's despatch as 'sneering, vaunting, and ironical.' (*Hansard*, cliii. p. 347.)

of the House all that one could wish. In the House of Commons I am told that the scene was most dramatic. Johnny in his best manner, holding his arm and stroking his elbow, expressed his indignation in the most dignified way. Stanley reeled, and tried to evade the question, when Pam hit him under the ear on the other side, and laid him prostrate amid cheers which rang all round the House. General Peel nudged Dizzy to come to the rescue, but, although obliged to get up in order to answer another question, he did not say a word for his friend. Stanley was seen soon after in a violent altercation with him. He may have reproached his friend for getting him into the scrape, or for not trying to defend him. Dizzy may have thought that there was nothing to say, or that as a suspected person he had better not put himself forward, or he may have been glad to give a lesson to the other to the effect that when a Minister never makes common cause with his colleagues, he must expect to be sometimes left in the lurch himself.'[1]

April 16, 1859.

'Thursday was a really satisfactory day for your friends, and ought to be so to you. At the end of your great troubles, and after being the object of so much hostile criticism, nothing could be more complete than the justice rendered to you by both Houses. Both Derby and his son spoke well and without any reticence about your great merits and services, and the feeling of both Houses was unequivocal, although Derby was not much cheered by his own side, probably owing to our cheering much.[2]

'The Elephant himself behaved well.

'Vernon Smith and Arthur Kinnaird have had a passage concerning Sir John Lawrence and the siege of Delhi, but Kinnaird merely said there had been a correspondence on the subject between Sir John and myself. The *Times* is sore at having failed in making Lawrence a peer, and the Evangelical party are going to make great play with him.'

LORD CANNING TO LORD GRANVILLE.

CALCUTTA, *April* 17, 1859.

'We have had Harris here for ten days, after giving up his Government to Trevelyan, with whom he is greatly pleased. I think the appointment a good one.[3]

'The hot season is upon us, but I foresee no difficulty in weathering

[1] *Hansard*, cliii. 312–330, 343–347.

[2] The vote of thanks to the Government and Army in India was moved in both Houses on April 14, 1859. *Hansard*, cliii. 1690–1727, 1729–1765.

[3] The Governorship of Madras.

it. Luckily, for I cannot leave Calcutta for any time until our financial prospects are more settled. I shall have a steamer ready to go to sea if a change is necessary, but not otherwise, for the Bay of Bengal in the monsoon is not pleasant.

'Johnny Stanley and his bear have fallen out. The bear would not sit still to be photographed, so Johnny proceeded to administer chloroform, against which the bear protested by biting him through a finger. He (bear) is now banished to Barrackpore.[1]

'The last political news we have is by telegraph that Disraeli is going to alter the disfranchisement part of the Reform Bill before the second reading. I am inclined to bet that the Government carry it through in some shape or other.

'I have had a private letter from Derby (very civil), announcing what you told me of G.C.B. and peerage; I have answered suitably. As to congratulations, I don't quite know. I should much prefer that the G.C.B. were delayed, and that both honours came together. As it is, I am about to have what John Lawrence has had nearly eighteen months. This, however, is not Derby's affair. I did not (I think) mention the subject to you—and certainly not to anyone else—at the time, but believe me it was a wrong thing (quite apart from private or personal feeling) to do what was done then. Vernon Smith, with naïve simplicity, told me that the Queen had objected to its being given to Lawrence as being discourteous to me. I am deeply grateful to her for her right appreciation of the truth; but indeed it was a matter of much more than courtesy. Nothing could have been done to raise more effectually—especially amongst the higher ranks of the Indian service—a mistrust as to the support which I was to receive from home than that passing over of the head of the Government to reward a civil servant under him. It did me, for a long time, much more damage than Ellenborough's letter. I could contend against the latter, not only by an answer to it, but by talking of it and making known my views of it to those around me. Against the former I could do nothing but hold my tongue. Either J. Lawrence's G.C.B. ought to have been delayed (which would have been no hardship to him) till the Governor-General could be noticed too; or, if that time appeared too uncertain and remote, the Governor-General should, in the then condition of India, have been recalled.

'However, this is all bygone, and only comes up again in a subdued form in consequence of the course which Derby now takes, but about which I cannot say, to him, a reasonable word.

'I don't think that I should ever have said a word—reasonable or

[1] Colonel John Stanley, second son of Lord Stanley of Alderley.

otherwise—even to you upon it, if I had not felt that I could not accept the congratulations quite heartily.'

LORD GRANVILLE TO LORD CANNING.

BRUTON STREET, *May* 7, 1859.

'I had forgot that it was post day, and have only time for a few facts and a few guesses.

'Derby wrote to me to say that you had accepted the Earldom, and that he wanted to know whether he might gazette you as Earl Canning, or whether he must wait for a second answer from India. I said that I had no doubt that you would wish to retain your name, but that I would write to your sister. She has written to say that you wish to retain the title of Canning, but are doubtful as to your second title. I have told Derby that he may gazette your Earldom, if he writes a formal letter saying that he will gazette your second or rather third title when he knows your wishes. Have I done wrong?

'I heard you preached about with great unction and eloquence by Brookfield last Sunday.'[1]

16 BRUTON STREET, LONDON, W., *May* 24, 1859.

'It was a great pleasure getting two letters from Calcutta, yours and Lady Canning's. I can quite understand your feeling about the G.C.B., and you are probably right about the effect in India; but I am of opinion that, as far as England was concerned, Vernon Smith was right. Sir John Lawrence's work was done—people here were clamorous for rewards for him. It would have exalted him unduly if it had been conceived by the public that the Government did not acknowledge his merits. On the other hand, your work was incomplete. Public opinion would not at that time have gone with any unanimity in favour of honours bestowed upon you. Pam's Government had not the slightest suspicion that they would not live long enough to do the proper thing, and now not only approval of the honours is universally felt, but there is a general feeling that they are below your merit.'

[1] The Rev. W. Brookfield used at this time to attract large and fashionable audiences to the chapel in John Street.

CHAPTER XII

LORD GRANVILLE'S ATTEMPT TO FORM AN ADMINISTRATION

1859

'WE cut a poor figure in politics,' Lord Granville wrote to Mrs. Grote at this time.

'The Government [he went on] without an increase of reputation is avowedly stronger. Time-servers who despised them two months ago will now support them. They are not in fact a very bad Government. People talk much nonsense of their being too democratic. What is objectionable in them is the encouragement they give to the absence of political principle. I am not in the least afraid of a Radical Government: firstly because I am rather Radical myself; and, secondly, because if other Radicals went further than I wished, I am sure that there would be a strong Conservative opposition in Parliament, and a Conservative reaction in the country. But when a Conservative Government is ready to give up anything that anybody asks for, it puzzles and unsettles men's minds. I expect, unless the chapter of accidents makes a diversion, that this Government will last two or three years, when, having accumulated their mistakes, people will again seriously wish for a change. We may hope that two or three years may produce a consolidation of the Liberal party; of which at present I see no signs.'[1]

Lord John Russell, however, was not willing to accept the prudent conclusion at which Lord Granville had arrived. Notwithstanding his resistance to extreme courses on the India Bill, his restless spirit was impatient of a prolonged political armistice, and a few days after his letter to Mrs. Grote had been written, Lord Granville, who

[1] Lord Granville to Mrs. Grote, August 8, 1858.

meanwhile had gone to Germany, received the following communication :—

LORD JOHN RUSSELL TO LORD GRANVILLE.

PEMBROKE LODGE, *August* 27, 1858.

'MY DEAR GRANVILLE,—Where are you, and what are you doing? We have been mostly here since the session was over. Public events have been favourable to this country, and consequently to the Government. There are various speculations as to Derby's selling his stud; the most natural and the probable one is that his horses are not very good, and he is glad of an excuse for selling them. Others think he feels certain of staying in office two years. I do not myself see how it is possible to frame a Reform Bill to which Derby and Salisbury can assent, and which Disraeli can propose with the least chance of success. The probability is they will go out in February. But who is to succeed them? That is a question to which I invite your attention.

'Yours truly,

'J. RUSSELL.'

To this letter Lord Granville replied as follows :—

CARLSBAD, *September* 1, 1858.

'MY DEAR LORD JOHN,—I was delighted to see your handwriting. Clarendon is here. There are no foreign swells, unless a rather lively French Minister of Commerce can be so called.

'It is difficult, when one does not belong to the House of Commons, to judge of the real feeling there, but the Government seem to have gained in everything but reputation. Time-servers who would have scorned them earlier in the session would be glad to support them now. Stanley has gained much, and Dizzy a little. The Liberals in your House seem to be still deplorably disunited.

'In our House, which is of incomparably less importance, I never saw our side so cordial and united; the usual effect of opposition. Derby, although he has lost some of his popularity, has and always will have great power there. His Chancellor, who appeared likely to be a catch, has turned out a complete failure.[1] Malmesbury has risen a little, from a very low starting point; and Donoughmore has proved himself useful in working bills. Pemberton Leigh is a gain to their side.[2] The others are nowhere, and Ellenborough will be a very candid friend.

'Jolliffe says that the Government will remain in till the day on

[1] Lord Chelmsford.

[2] Thomas Pemberton Leigh, Lord Kingsdown.

which the Liberal party is again united.[1] Sidney Herbert gives them till 1860 or 1861, by which time they will have accumulated mistakes enough to make the country desire a change. Lord Lyndhurst says that nothing but the chapter of accidents can turn them out, and the chapter of accidents may go either way. It will not be easy for anyone to make political capital out of a Reform Bill; but I doubt its being so great a difficulty for the present Government as for others. They will say: "We are not ardent reformers, but as the country expects, after the promises made by previous Governments, that there should be some reform, we have done our best to frame a wise measure. You will observe it contains some very Liberal provisions. If you like it, take it; if you can improve it, do so; reject it if you please. We do not wish to cram it down your throats." And they will very likely pass it: as they did the India Bill, partly by their own pliability, and playing one portion of the Liberal party against the other, and partly by the faults committed by the Opposition respecting Cardwell's motion. G. Lewis told me before leaving London, that you had been putting your ideas upon Reform into some sort of shape. I hope the Tories will get no inkling of your views before they produce their own scheme—it would help them much. With regard to a Liberal Government, I am of a very sanguine character. I believe things right themselves when the necessity arises, but the difficulty at present appears great, and I am inclined to think that it will be better for us if we are fated to remain some time longer in opposition. 'Yours, G.'

The winter of 1858–59 was spent by Lord Granville on the Continent, where the situation in Italy was every day becoming more threatening. 'Are you looking at the beautiful comet every evening?' Lady Canning wrote from Allahabad. 'We have full twenty-five degrees of tail, and a beautiful little round clear body, in size a large star, and in colour like the moon.'[2] The flaming signal in the high heavens suggested to Lady Canning the peaceful vision of absent friends, but at home very different associations. 'The largest comet I ever saw,' Lord Malmesbury, the new Foreign Secretary, recorded in his diary, 'with a broad tail spread perpendicularly over the heavens: the weather being very hot. Everyone now believes in war.'[3]

[1] Mr. Jolliffe, M.P. for Wells, was whip to the Conservative party.

[2] Lady Canning to Lord Granville, October 5, 1858.

[3] *Memoirs of an ex-Minister*, ii. 1858 (ed. 1884).

'Nothing [Lord Granville, writing from Rome, told Lord Canning] can be more deplorable. The separation of the Government and the laity is more complete than ever: the impossibility of reform from within greater than ever; the influence of the French, notwithstanding the large French force, absolutely *nil.* The Austrian influence for good not much greater. A complete stagnation of anything like intellectual development, and the material progress slower than that of any country with which I am acquainted. One of the results of the unpopularity of the Government is to drive the Monsignore away from society, thus depriving it of its only intelligent element. There were some pleasant Russians, a few not disagreeable French, and a considerable number of English, of whom the only available ones were the Spencers, a good young fellow with a pretty and charming wife, Egerton Harcourt, Colonel Percy, &c. &c. Mrs. Granville Vernon was there, but as she objected in a Christian point of view to heathen statues, and on Protestant grounds to Roman Catholic churches, her sight-seeing was somewhat limited. I shall be very glad to go back there with you in a couple of years, after a cure at Carlsbad, and with some hacks. We had a tiresome journey to Paris, again mostly by sea. We found the greatest excitement there. Everyone believing in war, everyone bitter against it. I literally did not see one person, including Walewski, Morny, Fould, Persigny, Rouher, all the Orleanists, all the Legitimists and Republicans, who was not violent in his language. It has given a great shock to the Emperor's position. War would be a most desperate game for him; and to withdraw from the position which he had taken up, will throw something of ridicule and contempt upon him. His objects were to mitigate the wrath of the Italian assassins, to fulfil some not very definite engagements with the Sardinians much in accordance with his own former Carbonari associations, to distinguish himself as a general, for which trade he has persuaded himself that he has great talent, and to occupy the public attention of France. He did not mean to announce his intentions by his speech to Hübner on the New Year's Day.[1] Nobody heard it but Cowley and Chelsea, and it would probably not have been known if Chelsea had not announced it at the Club. The Emperor has been much surprised by the tone of the English and German press, and by the strong remonstrances

[1] This speech was as follows:—'I regret that our relations with your Government are not so good as formerly; but I beg of you to tell the Emperor that my personal sentiments for him have not changed.' On February 3, in the House of Lords, Lord Granville said: 'These words might have meant everything, or they might have meant nothing at all.' *Hansard*, clii. 30.

of his own *entourage*, who for the first time have had the courage to tell him what they think, and to explain to him the feeling of the country. Of the latter he does not take so much account, as he has a great contempt for the French, thinking them fickle, and having seen them abuse everything which he has begun, and applaud everything which he has finished. He determined to hear what Plon-Plon had to say on his return from Piedmont, where the marriage has been as unpopular as in France, where they say that by this means *la France salit* (*s'allie*) *le Piedmont*; and to see how the cat jumped in the British Parliament. I came away from Paris with the impression that there would not be war this year, notwithstanding that the well-informed Thiers assured me that I was wrong. Our debates went well: Johnny and Palmerston, especially the former, having much modified what they intended. People in general approved what I said. I remarked that in the Lords, whenever I said anything in favour of the Emperor or the Italians, the House became nearly sea-sick, while they cheered anything the other way, as if pearls were dropping from my lips. I forgot to tell you that I had a long conversation with the Emperor the day before I came away. He talked peaceably, but made out his case against Austria, was overflowing with strategical details, but very anxious on the subject of the English alliance. He detests the Derby Government, and pines for Palmerston and Clarendon. I saw no difference in him, but Douglas says he is getting worn out. His placing Plon-Plon in so prominent a position, from which it is impossible now to dislodge him, creates a second Duke of Orleans at the head of the *branche cadette*.[1] The said Plon-Plon is supposed to be very clever, unscrupulous, and morally, although not physically, brave. The French as usual made jokes on all that passes, and put them into the mouth of the English Minister of Commerce, who rejoices that liberty is become so abundant in France as to be made an article of export. Talking of the speech to Hübner at M. de Broglie's, and abusing it, one of them said, "C'est vrai que l'Empereur parle rarement, mais il faut avouer que quand il parle, il parle—mal."'[2]

While the probability of a foreign crisis was thus present to the public mind, the relative claims of Lord Palmerston and Lord John Russell were still the theme of constant discussions. 'I believe the best plan,' Lord Granville wrote to Lord Canning, 'would be for Pam to come to the House of

[1] Prince Napoleon Jerome Bonaparte, son of Jerome, titular King of Westphalia.

[2] Lord Granville to Lord Canning, February 9, 1859.

Lords. Although Johnny has declared in the most positive manner that he will not serve under anyone, I think he can hardly object to the leadership of the House of Commons under a man who is already seventy-four, who consented to serve under him, and under whom he has served.'[1] Lord Grey was friendly in the House of Lords, 'but hating Pam, John Russell, and Derby in the order named.' Lord Granville thought that 'Pam did not mean "to throw over Johnny," but that he would bear it with great fortitude if others did so;'[2] while, on the other hand, he himself considered 'Johnny in a fool's paradise, thinking himself Prime Minister already.'[3] Lord John Russell's calculation was after all not so absurd; for he had greatly raised his reputation by his speeches on India; and if the course he had taken in regard to the India Bills had offended 'the hot Whigs,' it had been endorsed by public opinion as eminently reasonable and patriotic. Among his supporters to the leadership he now could number Sir George Cornewall Lewis, the *vir pietate gravis* of the Whigs; while the most influential of the Peelites, Mr. Sidney Herbert and Mr. Gladstone, it was known would prefer him as leader to Lord Palmerston in the event of a coalition.

The earlier months of 1859 passed away in abortive negotiations. In January Lord Palmerston was writing to Lord Granville on the assumption that Lord Derby would be able to continue in office for some time yet. His letter showed a mind far more intent on the great drama about to unravel itself in Italy, than on the changeful fortunes of British domestic politics.

LORD PALMERSTON TO LORD GRANVILLE.

BROADLANDS, *January* 30, 1859.

'MY DEAR GRANVILLE,—. . . Your letter is very interesting with its details of Paris news. As for myself, I am very Austrian north of the Alps, but very anti-Austrian south of the Alps. The Austrians have no business in Italy, and they are a public nuisance there. They govern their own provinces ill, and are the props and encouragers of

[1] Lord Granville to Lord Canning, February 10, 1859.
[2] Lord Granville to Lord Canning, March 3, 1859.
[3] Lord Granville to Lord Canning, March 14, 1859.

bad government in all the other states of the Peninsula, except in Piedmont, where fortunately they have no influence. Their claim of ancient "rights of possession" is groundless. Their title goes no further back than to the Treaty of Vienna of 1815; their "rights of possession" before that time had been swept away by French conquest. They are overstepping any rights which the Treaty of Vienna gives them, by their military occupation of the Papal States; and if they pretend to stand on their treaty rights, they ought not to go beyond them.

'I should therefore rejoice and feel relieved if Italy up to the Tyrol were freed from Austrian dominion and military occupation.

'But in politics as in other matters, it is not enough to show a desirable end; one must always be able to point out means of arriving at it, the objectionable nature of which shall not counterbalance the advantage of the result to be accomplished.

'Now the Austrians cannot be driven out of their Italian provinces without a desperate struggle, and however desirable their expulsion would be, those who might make or recommend or encourage a war for that purpose would incur a heavy responsibility. It is easy to begin a war, but difficult to set bounds to its range. A war begun to drive the Austrians out of Italy would infallibly succeed in its immediate object, but it might and probably would lead to other consequences much to be deplored. It is greatly for the interests of Europe that Austria should continue to be a great Power in the centre of the Continent; but if she was deeply engaged in a conflict in Italy, the Hungarians would rise, and Russia would threaten on the Galician frontier, and instead of seeing Italy freed, and nothing more, we might find Austria dismembered. But even if this were not to be, the bloodshed and destruction of life and property consequent upon such a war would far more than counterbalance the good that would be accomplished. I hope from what you say that the Emperor Napoleon will be overruled and that peace will be maintained; but if war should unfortunately break out, I am quite sure the only course for England is neutrality. We must stand aloof. Public opinion would not allow the Government to declare war against France, Sardinia, and Russia, in order to maintain Austria in Italy, and of course it is out of the question that we should take part against Austria.

'England is a party to the treaties which give Austria her Italian provinces, and we have no pretence for violating or disregarding those treaties.

'If Malmesbury has written to be shown to the Emperor such a letter as the Emperor describes, he really is unfit for his office. To tell France that she will not be permitted to go to war is to insult

her without being strong enough to make good the affront. To compare the position of Austria in Italy to ours in Ireland and India is utterly absurd. Ireland has been united to England for seven hundred years, and the people of the two islands make one nation. India we conquered and have kept by our own means. We have never had it conquered from us, nor do we hold it by a treaty grant from other Powers. 'Yours sincerely,

'PALMERSTON.'

Lord John Russell about this time had an interview at Wilton with Mr. Sidney Herbert. The personal popularity which the latter enjoyed with every section of opinion in the House of Commons, his high character and considerable abilities, would at any time have made him a desirable colleague. Almost alone among the Peelites he had been ready to act with Lord John Russell in 1855, and his position in that small but influential section rendered him a possible interpreter of the mind of Mr. Gladstone, whose power over the House of Commons was steadily in the ascendant.

Lord John Russell went to Wilton apparently willing to consent to a plan which contemplated Lord Palmerston being Prime Minister, but in the House of Lords. Lord Granville had also confided to Lord Palmerston, who himself confided the remark to Mr. Sidney Herbert, that he believed that Mr. Gladstone 'wished his former score rubbed off.' Lord John Russell and Mr. Sidney Herbert agreed that 'Oxford University is a drag not easily shaken off;' but to this observation Lord John Russell added in one of his dry sentences, 'Peel shook it off though.'[1] A coalition was now well in sight.

An account of what passed between Lord John Russell and Mr. Sidney Herbert at Wilton is contained in the following letter :—

WILTON HOUSE, SALISBURY, *May* 27, 1859.

'MY DEAR GRANVILLE,—Lord John left us this morning. I had two conversations with him of some duration. He is in a very

[1] Lord John Russell to Mr. Sidney Herbert, May 14, 1859.

unsettled state of mind; thinks a great deal of "what my friends will say," what the Liberals will think, &c. &c.

'He sometimes talks of serving under Palmerston; he leading the Commons and Palmerston of course going to the Lords; sometimes of Palmerston forming a Government and he supporting it out of office. The latter is simply impossible, and the former depends on Palmerston, who I have reason to believe objects to such a course for himself, at least for the present. They are very well agreed as to a Reform measure, i.e. to a franchise of 10*l.* in the counties, and 6*l.* in borough *rating*.

'I tried to impress on him that the man who forgets himself the most will be the best remembered by the country, and I told him very unmistakably that neither he nor Palmerston can form a Government without the other, and that Palmerston Prime Minister would have a far better chance than he, Lord John, would in that position.

'I do not think it a fair proposal to urge on Lord John that he should dine at Palmerston's dinner in order to give an outward and visible sign of union, for that would be simply following a lead, whereas the junction should be formed in the face of day for public objects on terms of previous equality. I am satisfied that if any step is taken to turn out the Government two things are necessary, viz. first, that the two rivals should agree to serve together as the Queen may direct. Secondly, to take the whole Liberal party into counsel, discuss the risks to be run, and the objects to be attained. They will no doubt say very disagreeable things, but they had better be said *now* than later; better in a dining room than in the House of Commons. It is well to know how far the two sections are willing to sink differences and support a Government if formed. The party require it and have a right to demand it. They are very independent in habits and feelings, and the time is gone by when they will vote like a flock of sheep for whatever some half-dozen men may concoct in a library. Depend upon it without previous frank conversation and interchange of opinion, no estimate can be formed of the chances of durability of a Liberal Government, and without such an estimate it is madness to turn out the existing Ministry.

'Even if you can get a bare majority to turn them out, which I doubt, without a clear understanding as to the future, who would risk the humiliation of having to take them back and submit to their rule after having declared our want of confidence in them?

'I hear that Palmerston is very averse to a meeting; so I think is Wood; but I am satisfied that you will not succeed without one,

and may get into the most serious hobble, if the consent or zeal of men is counted on, when they have not been consulted nor made responsible for the move to be taken.

'Lord John told me he had no complaint against Palmerston, but only against his subordinates, who had treated him very ill.

'Believe me, yours sincerely,

'SIDNEY HERBERT.'

Bearing in mind the distracting rivalries between the Liberal leaders, it was not strange that Lord Granville anticipated that the days of Lord Derby's Government were probably not yet numbered. As Lord Lyndhurst however had observed, there was still 'the chapter of accidents.' It would have been difficult for a Liberal Government in 1859 to refuse to introduce a Reform Bill. It was comparatively easy for a Conservative Government to decline to do so. But in an evil hour for themselves, Lord Derby and his cabinet were persuaded to try their hand, and they introduced a Bill. They immediately lost two of their most respected colleagues, who resigned;[1] they united their opponents; they alienated many of their friends; and on a motion made by Lord John Russell on the second reading, they were easily defeated. A dissolution followed. Although the Conservative party gained some seats, it soon became clear that they were certain to be in a minority if all the sections of the Opposition could again be got to act together on a critical division. At the suggestion apparently of Sir George Grey, Lord Granville wrote to Lord Palmerston on the situation thus created.

LORD GRANVILLE TO LORD PALMERSTON.

May 27, 1859.

'MY DEAR PALMERSTON,—The elections are so nearly over that we may calculate upon the Government having strengthened themselves sufficiently to form a strong party in opposition, but not enough to keep themselves in power unless the Opposition choose either by forbearance or by making some blunder to prevent their going out.

'It is open to the Opposition to take a magnanimous line, to declare that although they could form a Government, they could not

[1] Mr. Spencer Walpole and Mr. Henley.

in the present state of parties form a strong one, and that the times are too serious to embarrass whatever Government is in.

'This course would be unpopular with the Liberal party fresh from the elections, and would not be really justified by the conduct or character of the men in power.

'The other course is to attack them at once, and with a bold front. I doubt party spirit being strong enough on our side to "keep" very long, and it may speedily evaporate. It will be difficult to insure everybody voting on a question of immediate Reform, or on war, or on the criminality of the dissolution; but for one reason or another, from what I hear, all would join in a general vote of "want of confidence" if moved by an unobjectionable person.

'I do not know what J. Russell intends, but he is likely to wish to move something. Milner-Gibson is concocting some resolution. Bright, it is rumoured, says that he will vote for a resolution if moved by you on Reform, not if it is on foreign affairs. I think it would be wise in you to take some initiative: either to consult some of the leaders of sections, as to your moving a vote of want of confidence, or suggesting that some independent member, Sir John Ramsden for example, should do so. Probably the last plan would insure the least opposition, and create the least obstacle.

'Pray forgive my troubling you with the suggestion.

'Yours sincerely,

'GRANVILLE.'

An interview between Lord Granville and Lord Palmerston followed this letter, and on May 29 the latter summed up his views of the situation as follows:—

94 PICCADILLY, *May* 29, 1859.

'MY DEAR GRANVILLE,—I have been reflecting upon what you said to me to-day, and I feel as you do that it is important that an end should be put to the notion which has been so industriously spread among the Liberals, that there are jealousies and ill feelings between John Russell and me, which would prevent the formation of a Liberal Government, in the event of the overthrow of the present Administration; and I concur with you that the most effectual way of removing this impression would be that an agreement should be come to between John Russell and me, that we would both of us become members of any Government which on the overthrow of the present Government either he or I might be called upon by the Queen to form; and you are at liberty to propose that arrangement to him.

'Of course such an agreement would not apply to the case of any other person being commissioned by the Queen to form an Adminis-

tration. In such a case John Russell and I would hold ourselves free to take such course as we might each of us think proper.

'Yours sincerely,

'PALMERSTON.' [1]

A copy of this letter was sent by Lord Granville to Lord John Russell, who replied as follows :—

PEMBROKE LODGE, RICHMOND, *May* 31, 1859.

'MY DEAR GRANVILLE,—I have considered the letter of which you gave me a copy, and have come to the following conclusions :—

'1. That however important it is to put an end to the notion that there are jealousies and ill feeling between Palmerston and me which would prevent the formation of a Liberal Government, it would not be right that we should either of us surrender his liberty of action in a way that might lead to public injury, or to a breach of agreement.

'2. An agreement "that we would both of us become members of any Government which on the overthrow of the present Government either he or I might be called upon by the Queen to form," does appear to me to hamper most inconveniently our separate liberty of action.

'I think, therefore, the matter must be left where Palmerston and I left it at our last conversation upon the subject.

'I remain, yours faithfully,

'J. RUSSELL.' [2]

Mr. Sidney Herbert had suggested that Lord Palmerston and Lord Russell should be induced to call a meeting of the whole party at a neutral place, such as the Thatched House, 'where the violent might say their say, and then be satisfied to have their difficulties explained and more or less set aside;' [3] and it was now determined to call such a gathering at Willis's Rooms.

'In the days of our youth [said Mr. Disraeli] Willis's Rooms were managed by patronesses. The distinguished assemblies that met within those walls were controlled by a due admixture of dowagers and youthful beauties—young reputations and worn celebrities—and it was the object of all social ambition to enter there. Now Willis's Rooms are under the direction of patrons, and there are two of these patrons below the gangway. These are the noble lord the

[1] This letter is printed in the *Life of Lord John Russell*, ii. 305.

[2] Part of this letter is printed in the *Life of Lord John Russell*, ii. 306.

[3] Mr. Sidney Herbert to Lord Granville, May 27, 1859.

member for the City of London, and the right hon. gentleman the member for South Wiltshire.'[1]

When under these distinguished auspices the process of washing the dirty linen of the Liberal party had been successfully got through, a motion of want of confidence in the Government was without difficulty agreed upon. It was entrusted to Lord Hartington, and was carried by thirteen votes in a very full House on June 11. The Government at once resigned, and the political world waited in eager expectation during the next few hours for what was to come next.

On the following day it was announced that the Queen, instead of sending for either Lord John Russell or Lord Palmerston, had entrusted the task of forming a Government to Lord Granville. His immediate duty was obviously at once to open negotiations with Lord John Russell and Lord Palmerston; but in order to strengthen his own hands in the negotiations with them, he first consulted Sir George Lewis. 'My decided impression,' Sir George Lewis replied at once, 'is that retreat is impossible, and that a Liberal Government must be formed whatever may be its prospects of duration;'[2] and as Sir G. Lewis was essentially *vir pietate gravis*, Lord Granville bowed to his opinion and entered on his thankless task. He accordingly first of all saw Lord Palmerston, and offered him the lead of the House of Commons. Lord Palmerston accepted and consented to serve under Lord Granville, but only on a strict condition that a strong Administration was formed.

'It would be injurious [he pointed out in a paper which he submitted to the Queen] to the interest of the Crown and of the nation, that on such an occasion an Administration should be formed which by the weakness of its personal elements should be destitute of the inherent strength necessary to enable it to face and overcome the difficulties with which it must have to contend; and Viscount Palmerston deems himself bound by his duty to your Majesty, and by a proper regard to what he owes to himself, to say that to an Administration so composed he would feel it impossible to belong.

[1] Lord John Russell and Mr. Sidney Herbert. *Hansard*, cliv. 143.

[2] Sir G. Lewis to Lord Granville, June 12, 1859.

The promise, therefore, which he has given to Lord Granville has been made conditional on Lord Granville's success in organising a Government so composed as to be calculated officially to carry on the public service and to command the confidence of Parliament and of the country.'[1]

Mr. Sidney Herbert had warned Lord Granville in May that, in his opinion, there was no chance of Lord John Russell joining, unless Lord Palmerston would go to the House of Lords; and Lord John Russell, in a verbal communication to the effect that he was willing to serve under Lord Granville, now added that if he served under anybody except Lord Palmerston, he considered that he would not be able to do justice to his views—especially in regard to Reform and foreign affairs—unless he held the same position which he had held under Lord Melbourne—when he was leader of the House of Commons; and that he doubted if he would have confidence in any occupant of the Foreign Office except Lord Palmerston.'[2] This amounted to a proposal that Lord Granville should be First Lord of the Treasury and leader in the House of Lords; that Lord John Russell should lead the House of Commons, presumably as Lord President, following the precedent of 1854; and that Lord Palmerston should be Foreign Secretary and go to the House of Lords. Lord Palmerston, however, declined to give up the lead in the House of Commons, if he consented to serve under a person other than Lord John Russell. This amounted to a proposal that Lord Granville should be First Lord of the Treasury, and that Lord Palmerston should himself lead the House of Commons, with what office was not indicated, nor with whom as Secretary for Foreign Affairs, but presumably he meant Lord John Russell. Such being the personal factors of the situation, Lord Granville on June 11 wrote as follows to Lord John Russell:—

16 Bruton Street, *June* 11, 1859.

'My dear Lord John,—I saw Lord Palmerston again after my conversation with you. I informed him that you had no objection

[1] The whole of this memorandum is to be found in the *Life of Lord Palmerston*, by Mr. Evelyn Ashley, v. 156, 157.

[2] June 11, 1859. *Life of Lord John Russell*, ii. 307.

to serve under me, but that you considered that you could not do justice to your political views, if you were not Prime Minister, unless you occupied the same post as that which you held under Lord Melbourne, and that you doubted whether you should have any confidence in any other occupier of the Foreign Office excepting Lord Palmerston. Lord Palmerston told me that if he had been sent for by the Queen, he should not have thought it right to alter his position by going to the House of Lords; that if you had been sent for, he should not have required you to do so as a condition of his serving under you, and that serving under a third person he could not consent to abandon the position which he now held. I have seen Milner-Gibson, who considers it a *sine quâ non* that you and Palmerston should both be in the Government; that either of you below the gangway would be fatal to the Government; that he would prefer you as a leader in the House of Commons, but that he is ready to acquiesce in any arrangement with which you are satisfied. Gladstone, Herbert, and Lewis believe your joining to be of the greatest importance, but are of opinion that a Government must be formed, or the Liberal party will be disgraced. How this is to be contrived I do not know. I should be much obliged to you to let me know immediately whether your answer of this evening is final, as it is not fair to the Queen that she should not know as soon as possible whether I continue or give up the attempt. I must thank you again for your great personal kindness towards myself.

'Yours sincerely, G.'[1]

Lord Clarendon meanwhile was watching from The Grove the diplomacy of his two former leaders. In a letter to Lord Granville of great shrewdness, he at once put his finger on the essential points of the knotty situation, which he had possibly already guessed might be solved by his own sacrifice on the altar of political expediency. In his domestic evenings at The Grove he is described as sometimes reading some scene from Molière or some page of Macaulay to an appreciative audience of his own family and a few select friends whom he held entranced by his perfect diction and silvery voice.[2] The pages of Molière might perhaps have suggested some illustrations of the political situation; but if, deserting both the French dramatist and the historian of England, Lord Clarendon's readings at this time had

[1] This letter is printed in the *Life of Lord John Russell*, ii. 307.

[2] *Mary Boyle, Her Book*, p. 270.

extended themselves to the pages of Gibbon, he might have been attracted by the celebrated passage in which the author of the *Decline and Fall* describes the pretensions of the Popes and anti-Popes after the death of Gregory XI., and have found there an analogy between their rivalries and those of his two old chiefs. The answers of Benedict XIII. and Gregory XII. are said to have been alike 'edifying and alike deceitful,' and in evading the demand for their abdication they both were animated by a common spirit. When the one advanced, the other retreated: 'the one appeared an animal fearful of the land, the other a creature apprehensive of the water, and for a short remnant of life and power the jealousies of these two aged priests seemed likely to endanger the peace and salvation of the world.'[1] Nevertheless distracted Christendom attempted again and again to solve similar difficulties by deposing both the rival Popes, and electing a neutral successor. But the experiment had not always been successful, and the fate of some of these neutral choices gave cause for reflection, and even for warning. If the experience of a Martin V., who was reputed to have revived the unity of Christendom, was alluring, the fate of a Felix V., who found his own prerogatives disputed, and had to retire into seclusion, was ominous.

LORD CLARENDON TO LORD GRANVILLE.

June 11, 1859.

'MY DEAR G.,—The more I think upon this matter the more convinced I feel of the enormous, I would almost say the insurmountable, difficulties that must beset you.

'You cannot form a Government without Palmerston and John Russell being cordially with you, and even desiring to have you for a chief, as the best *mezzotermine* of their own differences; but you can hardly expect this, and I feel certain that, notwithstanding their apparent cordiality to you, each in his heart is deeply mortified at not having been sent for by the Queen. Each in his own way has answered you cleverly. Pam assented at once, and will be able to say that he did so; but rely upon it he expected you to fail in your undertaking. John Russell assented on certain conditions, which

[1] Leonardus Aretinus, quoted by Gibbon, *History of the Decline and Fall*, ch. lxxx.

when known would be rather popular both in and out of the House of Commons with the explanation he would give of them. He may possibly be better pleased that you should have been sent for by the Queen rather than Palmerston, but Palmerston will resent this public proof of her want of confidence in him given in the face not only of England but of Europe; and knowing as you do the characters of the two men, you can hardly doubt that they will a little sooner or a little later make common cause against you, and that they will have endless means of doing this. If they could safely be left out, or you could be sure that they *bonâ fide* approved of the arrangement proposed by the Queen, I should say, without an unmeaning compliment of course, that you unite in yourself all the qualities essential to success; but as you ought to have both these men in the Government, and as you would be powerless in the House of Lords against their proceedings in the House of Commons, I cannot help thinking it would be for your own interest and the public good not to attempt a task which seems to have so little probability of success, *unless* the Queen will agree to John Russell's proposal. In that case and Palmerston assenting also, I believe you might reckon on their acting cordially under and with you for a time, and the attempt might be worth making. You have shown your loyal devotion to the Queen by doing your utmost to carry out her wishes; but for her sake decide quickly upon abandoning or proceeding with the task, for every hour that passes will make her position more difficult with Palmerston if she has to send for him, and will diminish her powers to impose conditions on him. Before communicating your decision, whatever it may be, to the Queen, I think you should see G. Grey and Gladstone. 'C.'

Lord John Russell's second thoughts—whatever the reason may have been—were seldom his best. Up to this point, as Lord Clarendon pointed out, his attitude had been one which nobody could compare disadvantageously with that of Lord Palmerston. But on June 12 he sent a letter to Lord Granville which at least had the merit of straightforwardness, for it clearly indicated that further negotiations were useless, as on being informed that Lord Palmerston would not abandon the lead in the House of Commons in the event of Lord Granville being Prime Minister, he had decided to decline to co-operate in any arrangement in which, whatever office he might hold, he could only be the third and not the second person in the political hierarchy of the State.

PEMBROKE LODGE, *June* 12, 1859.

'MY DEAR GRANVILLE,—I thought I had made an answer to your propositions which you could submit to the Queen.

'I have no difficulty in repeating that, while I feel deeply her Majesty's great personal kindness towards myself, I cannot accept your proposal. What has passed between you and Palmerston, however, appears to me to free the position from some difficulties.

'It is clear that if I were to form a Ministry, I should have the assistance of Lord Palmerston.

'On the other hand, if he is to form a Ministry, I should expect him to propose to me any office I might choose (omitting of course his own), with the option of going to the House of Lords, or remaining in the House of Commons under him.

'That proposition on the grounds of fairness and equality I am prepared to accept.

'I hope I have made myself clear. With Palmerston I could only have to consider who is to have the first and who the second office in the State. With you I could only occupy the third, and should not feel that I had sufficient security either on foreign affairs or on Reform.

'I am afraid her Majesty must encounter the difficulty of making a choice; but I do not think either Lord Palmerston or I should be inclined to do otherwise than submit with respect and loyal duty to her Majesty's decision.

'I am glad that you feel I mean no personal unkindness to you. My resolution, however, as to your proposal is final.

'I remain ever yours very truly,

'J. RUSSELL.'

The attitude of Lord Granville on the extension of the franchise will be more fully explained in a subsequent chapter.[1] But why did Lord John Russell, who in 1852 had spoken of Lord Granville as one of 'the best Foreign Secretaries the country ever had,' consider in 1859 that with him 'there would be no sufficient security on foreign affairs'? It was because Italian affairs were the pressing question of the hour, and they were regarded from a different point of view by Lord John Russell and by Lord Granville. It has already been seen that, very shortly after the Congress of Paris, Lord Clarendon had written a despatch severely condemning the misgovernment of King Francis of Naples, and couched

[1] See below, p. 501.

in terms which almost amounted to a threat of intervention. Lord John Russell, though not in office at the time, had enthusiastically approved the despatch. Lord Granville took a different view of it. He objected to taking an attitude towards a small State which would not be taken towards a powerful country, and to risk an intervention which might cause a European war.[1] There were two objects at which British policy was aiming: the maintenance of peace, and the better government of Italy. Lord John Russell and Lord Palmerston thought most of the second, Lord Granville thought most of the first of these objects. Lord John Russell, as the sequel will show, was prepared to risk war to secure Italian liberty. Lord Granville was not prepared to do so. There was therefore a real and substantial ground of difference between Lord John Russell and Lord Granville.

With Lord John Russell's letter of June 12 the negotiations came to an end, as Lord Palmerston and Lord John Russell each insisted on retaining the lead of the House of Commons if either of them served under a third person. Neither would, in fact, consent to be the third person in the political trinity, though each was ready to consent to be the second.[2] The following letter shows definitely the position taken up by the two ex-Prime Ministers:—

LORD GRANVILLE TO LORD JOHN RUSSELL.

16 BRUTON STREET, *June* 12, 1859.

'MY DEAR LORD JOHN,—I am glad that I wrote to you yesterday evening, as your answer gave me information which I had not gathered from your conversation in the morning. I came away from Chesham Place with the impression that union between you and Palmerston, with or without me, was impossible. Your letter afforded a good opportunity for arrangement. As soon as I found

[1] Greville, *Journal of the Reign of Queen Victoria*, 1852–1860, ii. 219. Lord Granville to Lord Canning, February 9, 1859.

[2] 'Writers of authority and repute have thrown on Lord John the responsibility of Lord Granville's failure; yet it is certain that he had only expressed what Lord Palmerston had assumed.'—Walpole, *History of Twenty-five Years*, i. 195. See also the observations in Greville, *Journal of the Reign of Queen Victoria*, 1852–1860, ii. 255.

by it that I was an obstacle instead of a facility towards the formation of a strong Government, I went to the Queen to ask her to excuse me from the task which she had so unexpectedly and so graciously imposed upon me. In answer to a question, I stated to her Majesty that it was disagreeable to me to advise as to which of you and Palmerston she should send for, but that I was ready to do so if it was her wish. The Queen did not press me.

'It is a great relief to have finished this business. I have asked Palmerston to do whatever will strengthen the Government and assist him the most as regards myself.

'Yours sincerely, G.'

The arrangement which Sir George Lewis would have preferred was that Lord Palmerston should as Prime Minister go to the House of Lords, that Lord John Russell should lead the House of Commons, and that Lord Clarendon should be Foreign Secretary.[1] Under such a distribution of offices, Lord Granville, who desired a post of greater departmental activity than the Presidency of the Council, would have found a congenial post at the Colonial Office, which Mr. Gladstone had wished him to occupy in 1855, and was occupied by him in 1868 and 1886. He would have had to abandon the lead in the House of Lords for the time, but he actually did so, as will be seen in 1865, in favour of Lord Russell.

The arrangement actually made was probably the worst that could have been chosen. It diverted the active mind of Lord John Russell from the direction of home policy, in which it was needed, to the direction of foreign affairs, where it frequently became a source of danger. It drove Lord Clarendon from the Foreign Office and by the sense of grievance thus created strained the relations between him and Lord John Russell; and by leaving the Premiership and the lead of the House of Commons to Lord Palmerston, it condemned the period on which this narrative is now entering to be one of comparative sterility in domestic reform.

In a final and identical letter addressed to Lord Palmerston and Lord John Russell, Lord Granville recorded what

[1] Sir G. Cornewall Lewis to Sir E. Head, August 1, 1859. *Letters of Sir George Cornewall Lewis*, p. 372.

had passed during his negotiations with them. It ran as follows:—

16 BRUTON STREET, *June* 26, 1859.

'MY DEAR LORDS PALMERSTON AND JOHN RUSSELL,—I propose putting down on paper what passed between us while I attempted the construction of a Government, in order that you may both suggest anything which may appear to either of you as necessary or expedient to add or omit in any explanations to Parliament.

'On Saturday the 12th, I informed Lord Palmerston of what had passed between the Queen and myself, and asked him whether he would continue to lead the party in the House of Commons in an Administration formed by me. Lord Palmerston answered that he had thought it likely that the Queen would send either for him or for Lord John Russell, but that it was undoubtedly open to her Majesty to make any other arrangement; that he had joined in the vote adverse to the late Government for no selfish object, and having been then instrumental in destroying Lord Derby's Administration, he felt himself bound to co-operate in forming a strong and comprehensive Government. He had no objection to serve under me, and knew no one whom he should prefer.

'I then saw Lord John Russell and told him what had passed between the Queen and me, and between Lord Palmerston and me. Lord John in a very friendly manner stated that he had no objection to serve under me, but that if he was not Prime Minister he could not hope to give full effect to his political views unless he held the same post as he had done under Lord Melbourne, viz. the leadership of the House of Commons, and that he doubted whether he should have any confidence in any other occupier of the Foreign Office excepting Lord Palmerston. I saw Lord Palmerston again, and he told me that if he had been sent for by the Queen he should not have thought it right to alter his position by going to the House of Lords; that if Lord John had been sent for he should not have required Lord John to do so as a condition of his serving under him, and that serving under a third person he could not consent to abandon the position which he then held. I communicated again with Lord John, who informed me that my last conversation with Lord Palmerston freed the position from some difficulties; that if he had to form a Ministry it was clear that he should have the assistance of Lord Palmerston; and that, on the other hand, if Lord Palmerston was to form a Ministry he should expect Lord Palmerston to propose to him any office not held by Lord Palmerston which he might choose; that with Lord Palmerston he would only have to consider who was to have the first and who the second office in the

State, that with me he should only occupy the third, and should not feel that he had thus sufficient security either on foreign affairs on on Reform.'

On the 14th an account of the earlier stages of these events appeared in the *Times* purporting to contain almost 'the *ipsissima verba*' of the communications which had passed between the Queen and Lord Granville. The question at once suggested itself as to how was a newspaper able to know what had been said by the Queen. The Queen herself was greatly annoyed. She was believed to have said to Lord Clarendon, 'Whom am I to trust? These are my very words.'[1] This point was angrily pressed during the next few days by a political generation less accustomed than the present to communications with the press; and on the 16th the public mind was prepared for an awkward moment, when the House of Lords resumed its sittings, and Lord Derby it was known was to make a parting Ministerial statement.

'Before I sit down [the retiring Premier said] perhaps my noble friend opposite [Earl Granville], who I presume is about to become again the leader of this House, in which he has gained so much esteem and goodwill from both sides of it, will forgive me if I take the opportunity of referring to a circumstance which I think ought not altogether to be passed over in silence. My Lords, if there are any communications which ought to be invested with a character of most strict and inviolate secrecy, they are personal communications between the Sovereign of these realms and her advisers, and if it be possible to draw a distinction between different communications of that kind, none I think ought to be invested with that character in a more peculiar degree than communications between the Sovereign and the person who may be sent for to consult on the formation of a new Administration. Entertaining these opinions, which I am sure are shared by all your Lordships, I confess that it was with great surprise and regret on Monday morning last that I saw in the *Times* newspaper what purported to be a detailed account of the whole conversation which took place between the noble Lord opposite and her Majesty. Undoubtedly newspapers can draw their own conclusions and give accounts of who have gone into the palace, and whether this or that statesman has been communicated with. But I must say this is the first time I have seen a statement, given

[1] Greville, *Journal of the Reign of Queen Victoria*, 1852–1860, ii. 257.

apparently on authority, of observations made by her Majesty, of replies by the Minister consulted, and statements by her Majesty of the motives by which she was actuated in an attempt to form a new Government. I give to my noble friend opposite the entire credit of being absolutely free from the slightest charge of having sanctioned this publication. I am quite sure that the honourable character of my noble friend, and his sense of the duties which we owe the Sovereign, would have prevented his giving in the slightest degree his sanction to such a violation of official decorum and constitutional practice. But this is not a case of a document being surreptitiously obtained and transferred to a newspaper, nor is this paragraph a fabrication resting on the imagination of the writer, and falsely assuming statements of what actually did take place. Only one or two persons could have been present at that conversation—her Majesty, probably the Prince Consort, and my noble friend. It is therefore perfectly obvious that my noble friend's confidence has been grossly abused by some person or other. No doubt there was some one with whom it was his duty to communicate on receiving that communication from her Majesty, but clearly that person was not the editor of a newspaper. I am ready to receive an assurance from my noble friend that he gave no sanction to the publication, and that his confidence has been improperly abused by some one divulging information which ought to be kept strictly secret. I do not intend to take any further step in the matter. I prefer calling my noble friend's attention to it while I still sit on this side of the House, lest it should be thought I took an early opportunity of making a factious attack on the new Administration. I think my noble friend must have been as painfully struck with the fact as myself, and will consider he owes thanks to me for having noticed it and asked him to give an explanation.'

Lord Granville at once rose and replied.

'I feel [he said] that it is more proper I should postpone until another opportunity any remarks on public affairs, although I believe I shall do nothing improper if I at once tender our thanks to the noble Earl and those who formed the late Government for the assurance that, placed in very different circumstances, the new Government will receive no unnecessary opposition from them. The question of the noble Lord, however, referred to a matter upon which I trust your Lordships will allow me to give an answer. On the occasion of my last interview with her Majesty—on Sunday last—I asked her Majesty's permission to state to my friends that which had taken place at the previous interview to which I had the honour of being admitted; and, having obtained that permission, I in the

course of the same evening made a statement generally to several of my friends—some political, some private—as to what has passed upon that occasion, but I never meant in respect to any one circumstance to give her Majesty's language. I did, however, lay very great stress on the grounds upon which her Majesty sent for me, because I thought they would be calculated to show the constitutional motives by which she was actuated in taking that step. I read, I confess, with great regret the article which appeared in the *Times* on Monday, and to which the noble Earl has referred. It is quite clear that that article was founded on one or more of the statements which I had made myself on the previous evening. So far as that portion of it which relates to the conversation which I had the honour of holding with her Majesty is concerned, I may say, putting aside for the moment any appearance of disrespect which the publication in such a manner of that conversation may seem to imply, that what actually took place only serves to show how faithfully the Sovereign of this country adheres to those constitutional maxims the observance of which has been one of the greatest characteristics of her Majesty's reign. On the other hand, I am perfectly ready to admit to the noble Earl and to the House, that I very deeply regret that I did not use that complete reserve which would have entirely precluded the possibility of publicity being given to a conversation the purport of which could have been properly stated by me only in my place in Parliament and at the proper time. While I have no hesitation in saying that I am not guilty of that breach of confidence from which indeed the noble Earl has been kind enough to exculpate me, yet I at the same time feel that the observance of a greater degree of discretion on my part would have prevented the occurrence of that to which he has adverted.'[1]

On July 1 the new Ministers appeared in their places, and the statements customary on such occasions were made.

'I received the great and unexpected honour [Lord Granville told the House of Lords] of being commanded by her Majesty to attempt to form an Administration. There is no one in the House more sensible of the insufficiency of my own abilities for that task, but I was determined that, once having undertaken it, no diffidence of mine should prevent me persevering with it, as long as I thought any public utility could arise from my efforts. But as soon as I found a better and a stronger arrangement might be made, I at once requested her Majesty to absolve me from the office. That the resignation of it relieved me from a sense of great personal responsi-

[1] *Times*, June 17, 1859.

bility your Lordships will readily believe, and I gave it up with feelings of loyal gratitude to my Sovereign and deep respect for those public men with whom I had occasion to communicate. Since that time Lord Palmerston has formed an Administration. I have heard two noble earls describe in this House the labour and anxiety of forming an Administration, and certainly the personal relief which I myself had experienced in giving up the task was increased by closely watching the anxiety which Lord Palmerston experienced during the performance of his task, and especially from not being able to include in his Administration several of those old friends for whose character and abilities he felt such deep respect, and on whose long tried services he set such high value. He has himself assured me, however, that that feeling was much diminished by universally finding that those with whom he had communicated had expressed the most unselfish desire to postpone their own personal objects to the advantage of the public service.'[1]

The House received Lord Granville's statement in a friendly spirit; but to pour his tale into the sympathetic ear of Lord Canning was a more congenial task than explaining, either in public or in private, why old friends or new aspirants had to be left out of the Ministerial combination.

'I ought to have written day by day [he confessed] to tell you of the division, the resignation of Derby, the sending for me, my fruitless attempt to form a Government, the enormous weight off my stomach when I failed, the success of Palmerston in doing the same thing, the immense unpopularity of the present Government in the clubs and in Parliament, the fury of Ben and some others, my annoyance at finding myself between Elgin and Newcastle instead of between Lord Lansdowne, Ben, and Clarendon. The Tories expect us to fall out, and if not, to be speedily beaten by them and Bright. I believe, however, that many of the Conservatives will support Palmerston. Gladstone will be hard pressed at Oxford. If he could find a place elsewhere, I should be delighted for him and for us that he should be ejected from the University. Curious, Shaftesbury writing to support him.'[2]

In the new Administration Lord Granville once more became Lord President of the Council. The Secretaryship of State for India was held by Sir Charles Wood. 'I believe you like the Spider'—Lord Granville wrote to Lord Canning.

[1] *Times*, July 2, 1859.

[2] Lord Granville to Lord Canning, 1859.

'I do not think you will mind his pert letters. Clarendon mimics him at the Cabinet, pulling out his pencil, writing a few words or figures on a bit of paper, and throwing it over with a "There, you d——d fool!" sort of look. He showed great cleverness in securing his place. Pam was not anxious to have him, and Johnny determined that he should not be in the Cabinet, but the Spider stuck so close to his corner that there was no brushing him off. G. Lewis and I think he is too much an old Company man, but I am not sure that you do not approve. Clarendon is annoyed at losing the Foreign Office, but very friendly, and much pleased at Charles Villiers' accession to office. The latter has combed a little, grown fat, and a shade pompous on the strength of it. . . .

'Ben is frantic, makes the most praiseworthy attempts to be magnanimous, but *ça lui sort par tous les pores.*[1] Mars also is angry,[2] and talks of sitting on the cross benches on account of the Puseyite principles of Gladstone and Sidney Herbert. Vernon Smith makes a beautiful Lord Lyveden, and is enchanted with his new dignity, sits close behind us, and cheers, a House of Commons habit which will soon wear out. Ben Hall accepted the peerage, but declined parting with his grievance.[3] Elgin is discontented with the Post Office, very amiable in the House of Lords, but huffy at not being asked to take more part, and always afraid of taking anything which is not to be the means of a splash. I doubt his ever being of much use in Parliament. He is as yet very silent in the Cabinet, but I say this *unberufen.* Argyll has regularly taken the Indian Department in the Lords, which he does well, but is apt to start too many theories, not required for the occasion.

'Last year I fell off in my speaking, this year I think I improved a little. I wish I had a more working place, but the leadership is pleasant enough. Sidney Herbert and Somerset are good in their places. . . . Sidney Herbert's is, as you say, a really good appointment.[4] . . . Newcastle is keen against Lord John (whom I forgot to tell you the Queen has lodged at Abergeldy for safe keeping).[5] Somerset appears to do his work well.[6] Graham went out of town at the formation of the Government, commissioning Sidney Herbert to say that he would not take office. He is very friendly. Lord Aberdeen does not like our foreign policy, and he is grown more grumpy than formerly. I have for some time thought that those of us who

[1] Lord Stanley of Alderley had not been included in the Ministerial arrangements.

[2] Lord Panmure.

[3] Sir Benjamin Hall had also been left out. He was created Lord Llanover.

[4] Mr. Sidney Herbert was Secretary of State for War.

[5] The Duke of Newcastle was Secretary of State for the Colonies.

[6] The Duke of Somerset was First Lord of the Admiralty.

behaved very well to him have had some reason to complain of him. Grey is furious; he argued with Argyll. Argyll rejoined, "But there must be a Government." "Yes, that's the devil of it." Poor Cranworth was much annoyed, but behaves like an angel. Jock Campbell is first-rate in court, and useful in the Cabinet; enchanted, but as meek as possible. His extraordinary strength cannot last long.[1] He is in his eightieth year. When he goes it will be a great loss, particularly as I am afraid it will be impossible to prevent that clever but coxcombical Bethell from succeeding him.'[2]

The offer which he had received of the post of Prime Minister made Lord Granville the most influential member of the Cabinet in regard to foreign affairs next to 'the two old ringleaders' themselves, for it was by this term that Lord Clarendon described the two chiefs under both of whom he had himself formerly served. From the safe security of his pleasant home in Hertfordshire Lord Clarendon watched their performances with undiminished interest, biding his own time, and meanwhile uttering his own *suave mari magno*. Lord Palmerston and Lord Russell were now about to enter upon the troubled field of Italian affairs, where the Emperor of the French, having won a great victory at Magenta and driven the Austrian army out of Milan, 'was beginning to learn the unpleasant lesson that no war that is successful and does not drag on too much can remain unpopular in France; and all the inferences to be drawn thence.'[3] With Lord Russell and Lord Palmerston at length united over the Italian question there went Mr. Gladstone, who had accepted the Exchequer. 'He, Johnny, and Pam,' Lord Granville told Lord Canning, 'are a formidable phalanx when they are united in opposition to the whole Cabinet in foreign matters,'[4] and, as will be seen in the next chapter, they frequently were so, and to the Queen as well. Lady William Russell had confided to Lord Granville that she was glad that the two great masters Gian Bellini and Palma Vecchio had 'agreed to paint together;' but 'the results she expected to be some bold designs and fine chiaro oscuro.'

[1] Lord Cranworth had been Chancellor in Lord Palmerston's Administration, but was now passed over in favour of Lord Campbell, who was eighty years of age.

[2] Lord Granville to Lord Canning, June 27, August 10, 23, 1859.

[3] Lord Granville to Lord Canning, November 21, 1859.

[4] Lord Granville to Lord Canning, August 23, 1859.

CHAPTER XIII

ITALY

1859–1860

THE crisis in the Italian War had come almost simultaneously with the change of Government in England. The battle of Solferino was fought on June 24. Victory lay with the French and Sardinian armies, but at the cost of enormous losses. The previous efforts of the campaign had already severely taxed the resources of the allied armies. The Quadrilateral still remained intact; and the menacing spectre of a Prussian intervention was in the background, threatening to become distinct if Austria were pressed too hard. The popularity of war in France, as Lord Granville had pointed out to Lord Canning, might lead to any diplomatic excess as long as that popularity continued; but the Emperor Napoleon knew that it might at any moment collapse, and he determined that the time to negotiate had now arrived. He began by endeavouring to induce Great Britain to suggest terms of peace through Count Apponyi, the Austrian Ambassador in London, who was to convey them to Vienna stamped, it was hoped, with the seal of British approval.

'MY DEAR RODOLPHE [Lord Granville wrote to the Austrian Ambassador very soon after the formation of the Ministry], I write to you not as a minister, but as an old and intimate friend. It is of importance to Austria and to this country to be on good terms. There are questions respecting Italy on which the opinions of the two countries may disagree. This is no reason why there should not be a good and friendly understanding. I do not know if Lord Augustus Loftus has much influence at Vienna. Lord John has constant communication with the French Embassy: I suspect that

Brunnow sees a good deal of him—I am afraid you do not. Lord John is shy and reserved, and will never communicate with anyone, English or foreign, who does not in some degree force himself upon him. I think you ought to do so. You will understand my feeling in writing this note, and the confidence I feel in your considering it strictly private. I should not have written it to anyone I knew less well. . . . The influence you will exercise [he added in some words which were eventually struck out of the letter] will depend on yourself. Lord John is a very clever man, but is easily swayed by those whom he constantly sees.' [1]

Meanwhile the French Ambassador in London, Count Persigny, who had a policy of his own favourable to Italian ambitions but not precisely on all fours with that of M. Walewski, was engaged, as Lord Granville had anticipated, in attempting to induce the British Government to give active moral support to what he described to be the French conditions of peace. These, he stated, were the cession of Lombardy and Venetia by Austria, and the incorporation of the former with the Duchies of Parma and Modena and the Emilia with the Kingdom of Sardinia. Lord Palmerston, Lord John Russell, and Mr. Gladstone were disposed to agree. Lord Granville and the rest of the Cabinet were averse to committing themselves. In this view the Queen concurred, and the proposals were merely transmitted to Vienna without any expression of opinion. But while hurried messages were passing between the European Chancelleries, and the British Cabinet—though but a few weeks old—was engaged in discussions which already threatened a crisis, an armistice had already been signed, owing to one of the abrupt determinations characteristic of the wayward and uncertain temperament of the French Emperor. An interview with the Austrian Emperor followed and Preliminaries of peace were signed at Villafranca. But it was quickly seen that they did not settle the Italian question, though for the moment they stopped hostilities; nor were they consistent with Count Persigny's terms, although it would appear that the Emperor Francis Joseph had been somehow led to

[1] Lord Granville to Count Apponyi, July 1859.

believe that not only Great Britain, but also Prussia and Russia, would lend them their moral support.[1]

The Preliminaries were found to include the formation of an Italian Confederation of which the Pope was to be the head. The rulers of the little duchies of Central Italy were to be reinstated—all except Parma, which somehow had been forgotten ; at least, it was not mentioned. The cession of Lombardy by Austria and its incorporation with Sardinia were to be the only tangible results of the labours of Cavour and the victories of the French armies. Venetia, it was suggested, might enter the proposed Confederation while remaining Austrian, and therefore have the privilege of becoming a sort of Italian Schleswig-Holstein. Lord Palmerston and Lord John Russell saw their opportunity, and were not slow to seize it. Unfortunately at this moment the old suspicions were revived that Lord Palmerston was keeping back material information from the Queen, though Lord John Russell as Minister for Foreign Affairs—such is the irony of events—was now the technical offender. The immediate bone of contention was a despatch addressed to the Prussian Government, which, couched in vague language, seemed to point to intervention by Great Britain.

THE PRINCE CONSORT TO LORD GRANVILLE.

OSBORNE, *July* 12, 1859.

'MY DEAR LORD GRANVILLE,—The gravity of the moment will explain to you the anxiety of the Queen about the deliberations of the Cabinet, and the value to her not to be left entirely ignorant as to their feelings. Has the Queen's letter to Lord John, in answer to his proposal to lend "the moral support of England to the Emperor Napoleon at Verona," been read to the Cabinet? Lord John promised it should be, but we do not know whether it was. The decision of the Cabinet could not but be highly gratifying to the Queen ; but the further opinion of the Cabinet announced to the Queen by Lord John, "that it would be quite consistent with neutrality to employ the influence of the British Government to prevent the further effusion of blood, and to promote a peace which would be for the interests of all the belligerents," is so vague that it

[1] Martin, *Life of the Prince Consort*, iv. 460.

may cover almost anything. Who is to be the judge of those interests—Persigny, Azeglio, Palmerston, and John Russell? Is Austria to be admitted as the exponent of her own interests? Is Prussia to be allowed to state those of Germany, without being told that her notions about the Mincio line are mere exaggerations of military prejudices? The Queen is just writing again to Lord John to draw his attention to these points. The draft to Berlin went on the 7th. The Queen asked for a copy, never having seen it again since it came under review at the Cabinet. It is left as it was, with merely here and there an alteration of the expressions to soften them, and one or two unimportant passages left out! As the Queen had said, she would not object to the draft, as a mere expression of the opinion of the present Government, if unanimously approved of by the Cabinet. Lord John says now, that he thought himself justified to send it off after the Cabinet had seen it. To this the Queen has of course no answer; but the responsibility of the Cabinet becomes all the greater to exercise an efficacious control.

'Ever yours truly,

'ALBERT.'

LORD GRANVILLE TO THE PRINCE CONSORT.

LONDON, *July* 13, 1859.

'SIR,—I feel deeply grateful for the confidence the Queen and your Royal Highness show me. It, however, places me in this dilemma. Lord Palmerston and Lord John Russell are the ministers to whom it is natural that the Queen should look for information respecting discussions in the Cabinet respecting foreign affairs. They would resent such information being afforded through any other channel. They would consider it as a want of confidence on the part of her Majesty, and an improper interference on the part of a colleague.

'On the other hand, the importance of the crisis, the peculiar views and position of Lords Palmerston and John Russell, the extremely difficult duty now imposed upon her Majesty of watching the foreign policy of her Ministry, on which the most important results to England and to Europe may depend, make me more than usually anxious to obey her Majesty's commands, but it is desirable that no one should know that I make any written communications to your Royal Highness on this subject.

'Some of the questions put by your Royal Highness are a little out of date in consequence of the extraordinary news received yesterday.

'Lord John Russell read to the Cabinet the Queen's letter in

answer to the proposal sent from Richmond on Sunday, and it produced a great and useful effect. Lord John himself modified his proposal in consequence either of her Majesty's letter, or of the information received from Count Apponyi that the proposals transmitted to Count Rechberg by the English Government were totally unacceptable.[1]

'Three or four of the Cabinet hold with Lord John that neutrality need not necessarily be accompanied by impartiality; and that while we remain materially neutral, we may give our best wishes and the expression of those good wishes in favour of either party. The rest of the Cabinet are strongly of opinion, as far as I can gather (many of them being silent), that we ought to abstain from any demonstration on one side or the other, and that we ought to bide our time till we can really be of use; but that when we are invited, or feel compelled by circumstances to come forward, we are then at liberty to propose what may appear to be the best settlement of affairs which *could* possibly be agreed to, without considering whether such settlement is more favourable or not to one party.

'Lord John made a proposal to the Cabinet that he should write to the Austrian and French Governments to urge peace, to propose that the Emperors should settle the basis of peace, and that if they failed to agree, England would with or without Prussia and Russia propose terms to both belligerents. This was rejected by the Cabinet, and it is the third proposal of Lord John's in about as many Cabinets which has been so dealt with by his colleagues. It is difficult without a quarrel to insure that these decisions of the Cabinet are faithfully carried out. This does not arise from any wish of Lord John's to frustrate either the Queen's or the Cabinet's wishes. Lord Palmerston is generally very communicative to the Cabinet, and it is only on some point on which he lays great stress, and is determined to carry, that he acts without them. Lord John does so from a loose way of doing business, and from a dislike of submitting himself to any criticism. The Prussian despatch was sent in a form which was certainly not in accordance with the wishes of the Cabinet.

'Peace has now been concluded, a peace which falsifies the Emperor's promises, destroys the treaties of 1815, and makes no better or more stable arrangement of the affairs of Italy. Lord Palmerston is deeply mortified and annoyed, and his confidence in the Emperor is shaken.[2] I have hardly seen Lord John, and no Cabinet has been held, as we expected, to-day. It appears to me to

[1] Martin, *Life of the Prince Consort*, iv. 456. The despatch to Berlin is here alluded to.

[2] Ashley, *Life of Palmerston*, ii. 368; Martin, *Life of the Prince Consort*, iv. 462.

be lucky that England has been left out of this arrangement. I hope we shall not be forced into playing the part which Prussia did in the Congress of Paris. I trust that we shall not propose plans which it is impossible for us to enforce, and that we shall accept the facts as they are presented to us, at the same time not accepting responsibility which does not attach to us.

'It is very desirable as regards Lords Palmerston and John Russell that the Queen should show as much kindness as possible to the latter, and appear to communicate frankly with the former. 'G.'

Two days after the signature of the Preliminaries the Prime Minister wrote privately to Count Persigny, who was a ready listener, pointing out that a treaty based on them would be doomed to failure.[1] The same view was urged with unanswerable force by Lord John Russell in official despatches addressed to the British representatives abroad.[2] Nor did it take long to convince the Emperor of the French that a large portion of the Preliminaries could not be carried out. The inhabitants of the Duchies showed the most extreme unwillingness to receive back their exiled sovereigns. The revolutionary movement was in possession of Tuscany, the Emilia, the Romagna, and the Marches; and rather than be a consenting party to the Preliminaries, Count Cavour had indignantly resigned. Beset by these difficulties, the Emperor hoped to find a way out of his troubles in the Conference which was to assemble at Zürich in order to confirm the Preliminaries by a formal treaty. He hoped to get the support of Great Britain to new proposals, and to induce all the Great Powers to enter the Conference, which in that case would have assumed the character of a European Congress.[3] According to the Emperor's ideas, these new proposals could advantageously come from Great Britain, but he considered himself debarred from making them by the pledges which he had given to the Emperor of Austria at Villafranca. The Cabinet, however, after much discussion declined to entertain these ideas, yet no clear agreement

[1] Ashley, *Life of Palmerston*, v. 161–165.

[2] Walpole, *Life of Lord John Russell*, ii. 310, 321, 322; *Hansard*, clv. 543, 546.

[3] Martin, *Life of the Prince Consort*, iv. 463, 474.

was come to whether the refusal was intended to be tantamount to declining to give advice even on the general situation till after peace had been concluded, and what degree of responsibility was to be taken if advice were offered and then refused by either France or Austria. Serious dissensions consequently broke out when Parliament was about to rise, as the Foreign Secretary had written a despatch which proposed to ask for information as to the intentions of the Emperor of the French before his invitation to a Conference could be entertained. The Queen objected to this inquiry as being a veiled form of intervention;[1] and the despatch, which was dated July 25, was suspended after much recrimination till after the Conference of Zürich.

Parliament was prorogued on August 13. But in the last days of that month, after several communications between Lord Palmerston and the French Ambassador, who was trying to force the hand of the Emperor and M. Walewski, just as Lord Palmerston was trying to force the hand of the Cabinet, the 'two old gentlemen,' as Mr. Sidney Herbert termed the Prime Minister and the Foreign Secretary, again 'concocted a despatch' saying that the Duchies ought to be annexed to Piedmont, and the Duke of Parma compensated with the Legations.[2] This proposal, Mr. Sidney Herbert told Lord Granville, reminded him too much of the proposals which were being simultaneously put about—it was believed with the knowledge of the French Emperor—to recast the map of Europe. The Queen considered that this proposal also was contrary to the pledge which she understood had been given that no separate proposal should be made till after the Conference at Zürich. If the Conference ended in nothing, if the *déchéance* of the Archdukes were accepted as a necessity, and if a proposal were then made by France for the rearrangement of the map of Italy, then 'if France were honest in her professions' Great Britain might agree to discuss them.[3] Beyond this the Queen would not go.

[1] Martin, *Life of the Prince Consort*, iv. 474, 482–484.

[2] Mr. Sidney Herbert to Lord Granville, August 25, 1859.

[3] General Grey to Lord Granville, September 7, 1859.

The Prince Consort reported his anxieties to Lord Granville in the following letters.

THE PRINCE CONSORT TO LORD GRANVILLE.

OSBORNE, *August* 25, 1859.

'MY DEAR LORD GRANVILLE,—You will be sorry to hear that we have had disputes about drafts daily for the last two weeks. On the Queen's refusing to sanction, they were withdrawn, but others *worse* in tendency submitted. It has arrived at that point that Lord John himself asks for what the Queen has all along stood out, viz. the necessity of a meeting of the Cabinet. One of the drafts offers to France a repartition of Northern Italy, giving all the Duchies to Sardinia, and making Duke Robert (late of Parma) "hereditary Viceroy of all the Pope's Dominions" minus the city of Rome, and making Austria remit a sufficient amount of the Lombardy debt to enable the King to build the fortresses necessary to keep Verona and Mantua in check! The despatch of July 25, which was not to be communicated till after the peace was signed at Zürich, is now to be given to the French Government! 'Ever yours truly, A.'

Thus it happened that the Cabinet had not been in office two months before a serious crisis was in sight.

'Pam has been to the War Office [Mr. Sidney Herbert told Lord Granville] with rather a long face on the Queen objecting to all Johnny's despatches. The Queen further forbade giving any advice or opinion at Paris on the Italian question as intervention. Pam, who in this is entirely with Lord John, wrote to remonstrate, and to point out that she permitted the other Government to intervene up and down. He seemed a good deal annoyed, and said he doubted whether he ought to call a Cabinet or not. As he goes to Osborne to-day, I recommended waiting till the result of the personal interview was ascertained; and that he should not put what he calls the "constitutional" argument to the Queen, which, after all, is a threat and means: "You must yield, or I resign." I expressed a wish that he would not *lâcher le gros mot;* or he would in the long run, to say nothing of the short one, get the worst of it. In the present evenly balanced state of parties and strong anti-French feeling, the Court could ride its race its own way. I shall be a little anxious to hear how the Osborne visit goes off, and I am a little nervous as to Pam's way of describing our relative positions. "If we differ your opinion must yield to mine," is not an agreeable statement to hear, nor a prudent one to make to a person who has

a good deal of indirect power, and the spirit to use it if *poussée à bout.*'[1]

Mr. Sidney Herbert was of opinion that in this controversy the Queen was fighting the battle of the Cabinet as well as her own, as their decision had been, in his opinion at least, that while diplomatically resisting the intervention of the Powers in Italy, this country was not, at least at this stage of affairs, to intervene actively by entering the Conference, or by putting forward any positive proposal; but he thought the Queen too unyielding in her objection to even a request for information as to French intentions before consenting to enter a Conference, as a form of intervention.[2]

The Foreign Secretary now suddenly proposed that Lord Granville should go to Paris in order to watch events, probably suspecting that Lord Cowley was not altogether as devoted to the cause of a united Italy as he thought to be desirable in the British Ambassador at such a moment.

LORD GRANVILLE TO LORD CANNING.

August 23, 1859.

'MY DEAR CANNING,—I am for the first time in the disgraceful but proud position of owing you two letters. The questions in your letter of July 11 prick my conscience, as I ought to have anticipated them all. However late, I will answer some of them now. The Cabinet goes on harmoniously. Johnny and Pam like twins, too much united on foreign affairs, for with Gladstone as their ally they are inclined to meddle too much in Italian affairs. The rest of the Cabinet, however, saved them from several great mistakes, particularly rushing blindfold into a Conference. Johnny is impatient of criticism, but is pleased and absorbed by the duties of his office. His misfortune is that he is always dying to connect his name with something. I was much alarmed last Wednesday. Sidney Herbert told me that Palmerston had told him approvingly the night before that Johnny wished me to go and stay at Paris, in order to see how things were going on, and to take advantage of any movement. I should not like any mission which was not clear and defined, and understood both at home and abroad. In this case I could do no good, and could have no success. I do not believe the Emperor

[1] Mr. Sidney Herbert to Lord Granville, August 25, 1859.
[2] Mr. Sidney Herbert to Lord Granville, August 28, 1859.

would have any confidence in me, and I am sure that all Cowley's fat, or rather lean, would very justly be in the fire. As we had a Cabinet in the afternoon, I expected to hear something of it from Johnny, but he said nothing, and I slipped away that evening into Yorkshire. I do not like refusing that which persons competent to judge think good for the public service, but no one is bound to place himself in a false position. 'Yours, G.'

Meanwhile the Prime Minister had been to Osborne.

LORD GRANVILLE TO THE DUKE OF ARGYLL.

August 31, 1859.

'MY DEAR ARGYLL,—You missed a Cabinet which was amusing and might have been of deep interest. As it is possible that no one has written to you, I will try to give you the pith of it. I got a letter from Sidney Herbert on Wednesday, describing a visit from Pam much perturbed by the Queen objecting to all John Russell's drafts, and by her considering all advice as intervention, and determined to press the constitutional argument on his visit that evening to Osborne. Sidney Herbert gave him good advice, but evidently thought the Queen unreasonable. I heard nothing more till the receipt of the telegram summoning me to a Cabinet on Monday. I went immediately to town, and saw Pam. He told me that there had been breezy weather at Osborne, that the Queen considered all advice as intervention, and had objected to the communication of the despatch of July 25 (asking for information before we went into Conference), although he and Lord John thought the proper moment had arrived for communicating it. He read me a well-written memorandum of his own to the Queen on the abstract question of giving advice. He had been to Osborne, had been met by the Spider, who told him that the Queen was much agitated, and did not feel equal to discuss the matter with him. He had had a long conversation with the Prince, and he gave me his Royal Highness's arguments briefly, and his own at considerable length. The Queen wished for a Cabinet where this matter might be settled, and where our Italian policy might be settled previous to the recess. Lord John also wished it. I said what I thought judicious to heal the breach between him and the Queen. He said that they had never been on better terms. I gave him my opinion of our Italian policy, in which he concurred.

'I then saw Herbert, who told me that since he had seen Wood, to whom all the papers had been shown, the whole aspect of things was different. It was clear that the Queen, instead of opposing her Cabinet, had come to their rescue—that Lord John had submitted to her a draft of a despatch to Cowley, parcelling out Italy, giving the

Duchies to Piedmont, releasing Piedmont from a sufficient portion of her debt to enable her to build fortresses against Austria, and allotting the Papal States excepting the city of Rome to Robert Duke of Parma; that the Queen had objected, but that Johnny kept reproducing his draft with different words, and had also proposed to communicate the despatch of July 25, although that despatch finished by a sentence written in Lord John's hand, saying that it was not to be communicated till after the Peace of Zürich, which sentence was described, in a private letter of Lord John's of the same date, as an addition of the Cabinet which he entirely approved. Sidney Herbert told me that Lord John was in a state of great irritation, that he said we might as well live under a despotism, and that he threatened resignation.

'Gladstone told me that he had heard the whole story from Pam, and that he thought the Queen had been somewhat unreasonable.

'We met on Monday—Johnny very nervous. He made a confused statement. He read the Queen's minutes fast and low—would not (contrary to her request) produce his own drafts. Sidney Herbert, Newcastle, Wood, and I, who knew what was in them, questioned him closely about them, and he, I am sorry to say, equivocated immensely. He then read us a new draft, which he said blended all the other drafts and the despatch of July 25. It began by a virulent attack upon Austria, abuse of the Confederation in a manner offensive to France, and an insistence on the Duchies being joined to Piedmont, ending with a tremendous tirade: "It has been said that it is not for England to give advice," then proving that she ought to give advice; "who will now venture to assert that England" &c. Pam spoke for Johnny, and bitterly as regarded the Court. The rest of the Cabinet condemned the new draft, assented to the assertion that the Queen had not acted unconstitutionally, and had only declined to sanction without their concurrence that which she considered they had previously decided. It was, however, agreed that with respect to the despatch of July 25 the Queen had mistaken the intention of the Cabinet, who only wished to prevent us giving an affirmative answer to going into Conference until after the Peace of Zürich, and that the despatch might now be given.

'Gladstone backed up the majority of the Cabinet after he knew the facts, and told us that he was much surprised at the want of memory shown by Pam in his statement to him, and that he thought the Queen had been wantonly put to much unnecessary annoyance.

'It has ended very well. Johnny has had a lesson that the Cabinet will support the Queen in preventing him and Pam acting

on important occasions without the advice of their colleagues. A schism very dangerous to the Court and to the Government has been postponed.

'I forgot to say that Pam asked for fuller powers to act during the recess, which was met by a general assurance of readiness to come up by night trains. Johnny is gone to Abergeldie—G. Grey to Balmoral: the latter is sure to do all he can to soothe both parties.

'Yours, G.'

At the end of the session Lord Granville went to Aldenham. Thence he wrote to Lord Canning.

LORD GRANVILLE TO LORD CANNING.

ALDENHAM, *September* 4, 1859.

'MY DEAR CANNING,—I came down here immediately after writing my last letter to you, and have consequently nothing to tell you. Johnny Acton, who is extremely agreeable, left us two or three days ago to go to Germany, with the intention of coming back to study in the middle of October. His library is becoming immense. He has remodelled the old library. He has entirely filled the hall; he has furnished his own room with books, and he has bagged a bedroom for the same purpose. I can hardly open a book without finding notes or marks of his. His new position as M.P. has done him much good. It has taken away from him the suspicion that people undervalued him, and he appears to appreciate some of the fine ladies being coquettish with him. Lowe (the fat keeper) gave me a day's shooting on his own preserve, I know no one more agreeable. I asked him whether Acton did not manage to kill the deer. "Well, my lord, I don't think he ever takes aim:" adding with much feeling, "I am sorry to say." 'Yours,

'GRANVILLE.'

If Lord Granville was delighted with Aldenham, he was able to tell Lord Canning that the Foreign Secretary was delighted with Abergeldie. He himself expected to be at Balmoral in the second week of September. Lord John Russell had not abandoned his plans of intervention in Italy, and there was soon to be stormy weather again in consequence. The Queen was definitely declining to discuss the question of intervention any further, and Sir Charles Wood, who had gone to Osborne as Minister in attendance just before the Queen left, had returned with a message for

Lord Palmerston that she would not allow the subject to be broached again. But meanwhile M. Walewski was pointing out to Lord Cowley that if Great Britain refused to enter the Conference in order to help France to clear up the European situation, and contented herself with suggesting terms inconsistent with the Preliminaries, as Lord Palmerston had done in a letter to Count Persigny, yet declining to take any responsibility for them as Minister, the responsibility for the renewal of war would rest with Great Britain, in the event of a refusal on the part of Austria to consent to any alteration in the Preliminaries. France might in that case either retire from the struggle, in which case '*Sardinia*' would probably be beaten, or might be a party to the annexation of the Duchies by '*Sardinia*' and other territorial changes, subject to compensations to be obtained elsewhere in her own interest. There was indeed, he suggested, one other alternative: that Great Britain should join France and Sardinia in the event of a renewal of hostilities, and compel Austria to accept terms. This suggestion fell upon friendly ears.[1]

Lord Clarendon wrote to Lord Granville that a closer acquaintance with the Italian *imbroglio*—not to mention other subjects—had, he fancied, 'considerably abated the *veni, vidi, vici* sort of feeling with which Johnny had taken possession of that bed of roses, the Foreign Office;' and although the position of England was thought, as he himself considered, most erroneously 'by the son of Venus'—for so he termed the Prime Minister—to be 'imposing,' that he doubted nevertheless if it were wise 'to assume the title of the conqueror of Talleyrand and Metternich.'[2] But however just Lord Clarendon's opinion might be as to the propriety under the circumstances of remorseful feelings on the part of the two veterans, no doubts or scruples troubled their hearts, and they treated with unconcern the constant apprehensions of their colleagues as well as of the Queen and the Prince Consort, that a widening of the area of disturbance in Italy and a further alteration of boundaries might bring

[1] Martin, *Life of the Prince Consort*, iv. 487–490.

[2] Lord Clarendon to Lord Granville, September 27, October 6, 1859.

Germany into the field, and thereby justify the attack on the Rhine frontier which the Queen believed was the ultimate object of the French Emperor. This danger Lord Palmerston and Lord John Russell either considered exaggerated, or were prepared to face. The French army, they believed, was in no condition to face a German war, and they desired to secure for ever the good-will of the people of Italy. Already in proportion as the secrets of diplomacy leaked out, Great Britain was rapidly substituting herself for France in the affections of the inhabitants of the Italian Peninsula. Lord Palmerston and Lord John Russell were now more than ever hand and glove together.

'Nothing [Lord Granville wrote] can be more intimate than the alliance between Palmerston and John Russell on foreign affairs; generally backed by Gladstone, and opposed by all the rest of the Cabinet.' 'It is a good illustration of the value of human prophecy, that whereas we all feared danger from the disunion of the two great statesmen, our chief difficulty now is their intimate alliance. . . . I hope it will all go on well on Deeside.'[1]

The Queen had now reached Balmoral. The Foreign Secretary was close by at Abergeldie. Thence, supported by Lord Palmerston from Broadlands, he carried on a sharp paper warfare with the Queen and his colleagues. The Prince Consort told Lord Clarendon that the Royal *séjour* in the North had been embittered by this 'most painful paper warfare with the two men.' The Foreign Office despatches, in the opinion of Lord Clarendon, 'contained nothing but the revolutionary doctrines of Ivan Ivanovitch'—his favourite nickname (one of many) for the Foreign Secretary—and they scandalised the staid diplomatists of the Continent, unprepared as they were for the sudden revival of methods by which Lord Carteret was said to have recommended Henry Fox in the previous century 'to knock the heads of the Kings of Europe together, and jumble something out of it which might be of service to this country.'[2]

[1] Lord Granville to Lord Canning, December 16, 1859.

[2] Lord Clarendon to Lord Granville, November 23, December 2, 1859. Lecky, *History of England*, i. 378

'Matters do not mend [General Grey wrote to Lord Granville in September]. The feeling of annoyance and dissatisfaction here is great, and it is very difficult to lessen it. The Prince went yesterday to Abergeldie and had a long conversation with Lord John, following up a letter written to him by the Queen, which I have not seen. I think it very important that, whatever passes between the Queen and Palmerston and the minister resident here, the opinion of the Queen should be conveyed directly to Lord John, and that he should have no ground for suspecting that other advice was given or taken without reference to him. The Prince tells me that he readily agreed to write in the sense the Queen wished, which I think I mentioned to you in my last letter. He and Lady John dined here yesterday, and the Queen was very gracious and in good spirits. But this morning the Prince came to me, and said things were worse than ever; not with Lord John, but with Palmerston. He brought me a letter from Palmerston to Lord John—which Lord John had sent to the Queen—giving a full account of a conversation between himself and Persigny, in opposition to all he had heard of Walewski's opinion. After referring to our "protest," and asserting, as he had done before, that the Emperor stipulated verbally at Villafranca that force should not be used, he stated that "so far we were agreed. What then was to be done?" Persigny's scheme was a close union between France and England to compel Austria to yield to the annexation to Sardinia, and it went beyond anything; as it proposed to suggest not the secularisation of the Papal Government, but the depriving the Pope of all temporal government;[1] giving part of his dominions to Sardinia, part to Naples, placing Rome itself on the footing of Frankfurt: the two Powers Sardinia and Naples securing an income to the Pope who is to be reduced to the exercise of purely spiritual authority. Well, Palmerston, of course, had no objection to make, and after premising that the conversation was only between two friends, expressed his entire concurrence, and undertook to report the conversation to Lord John; and to him he says, "What shall I say to Persigny?"'[2]

Lord Granville was about to proceed to Balmoral in September. The Queen knew the great influence which he possessed with the Foreign Minister; and as Minister in

[1] A curious chapter of history might be written on the proposals made at various times by the ministers of Roman Catholic States to secularise or entirely disestablish the temporal Government of the Pope. As to Thugut's plans see *Life of Lord Minto*, iii. 97.

[2] General Grey to Lord Granville, September 6, 1859.

attendance he was likely to be able to play the part of mediator with effect between Balmoral and Abergeldie. But a deep private anxiety came at this time to prevent the journey.

LORD GRANVILLE TO LORD CANNING.

16 BRUTON STREET, LONDON, W., *September* 10, 1859.

'MY DEAR CANNING,—I am here instead of Balmoral, in consequence of poor Marie being far from well. I cannot help being anxious. She shows angelic patience and gentleness.

'Charles Wood and I dined together last night. He is going to have a fight with the Council, in which he is right, but will have some trouble. He is going to put the office on a more regular footing, and give more initiative to the Secretary of State. He will have the support of the Staff. He proposes to have a Committee of Cabinet on the organisation of the Indian army. He puffs you immensely, and says that the work you do is done in first-rate style. He suspects that you are so determined to do all the work yourself, that you are sometimes obliged to postpone things. I think this is possible. 'Yours, G.'

Lady Granville was able to go to Germany, but her illness took a rapid turn for the worse. In October, Lord Granville was at Herrnsheim. Thence in November he succeeded in bringing Lady Granville back to England after an arduous and painful journey. At one moment it seemed that Lady Granville's case was desperate.

LORD GRANVILLE TO LORD CANNING.

HERRNSHEIM, *October* 26, 1859.

'MY DEAR TRUE FRIEND,—I wish myself to be the writer of that which will deeply afflict you both. I have no hope of your ever seeing my poor darling Marie again. She liked you both so much, and always encouraged my attachment to you, as she did everything which she thought for my good.

'She received the last sacraments on the day before yesterday with a serenity which was sublime. Her countenance so beautiful, noble, and pure, that she seemed of another world. She said six weeks ago on our way to Carlsbad, that her life had been too happy to give it up without a pang, but she now only cares for those who she thinks will feel her loss.

'She was much too good for me to keep. My life has been too

happy and too easy with her, to dream of such agony. You will pity your poor friend, and so will your dear wife.

'Since the last religious ceremony she became so much better that the doctor authorised moderate hopes, but last night was agitated although followed by a good morning; but I know it is all in vain.

'Your affectionate G.'

HERRNSHEIM, *November* 3, 1859.

'MY DEAR CANNING,—One line to tell you that all our grief has been turned into intense joy. How you will both rejoice. Poor darling Marie, after having received extreme unction, and had the prayers for the dying twice read over her, bearing her trial with a firmness and a gentleness which it is impossible to imagine, made a rally, and now, with the reservation of certain contingencies, the doctor thinks her out of danger.

'I have received a charming letter from you, which I will answer, but am not sure whether a day's delay from here would not make this letter lose the post. 'Yours affectionately, G.'

LORD GRANVILLE TO THE DUKE OF ARGYLL.

HERRNSHEIM, *November* 15, 1859.

'MY DEAR ARGYLL,—A thousand thanks for your interesting budget of news.

'Although Lady Granville is wonderfully well considering what she has gone through, yet there are too many ups and downs not to feel much anxiety. We had some hopes of starting to-day, but the doctor, Hochberger, did not think it prudent at the last moment. He has been remarkably skilful, patient, and attentive.

'I wrote to Palmerston, suggesting that it would be better for me to resign under the present circumstances, but he wrote a very kind letter (in an altered handwriting, by the bye) in which he would not hear of it. Although very sorry to separate myself even temporarily from all of you, I should like to do it, but the doctor and all the family are convinced that it would have a bad effect upon her.

'I am glad that you are swimming more or less through your difficulties. There is a great uneasiness amongst moderate Frenchmen at the probability of the bad feeling between England and France leading to war.

'The Emperor's difficulties about Italy, and the growing discontent of the clergy, upon whom he has leant so much, may drive him to a desperate move. Our line should be firmness, but giving no reasonable occasion of offence, and we ought to conciliate a little more the feeling of the rest of Europe. Their reason is against France, but

their feelings violent against us, which Hammond once told me was always the wholesome sign. 'Yours, G.'

LORD CANNING TO LORD GRANVILLE.

AGRA, *December* 6, 1859.

'MY DEAR GRANVILLE,—I hardly dare to write. The last accounts are so bad that I do it in fear that the terrible blow must have fallen long before this can reach you. Yet I cannot bear to be silent. I never so thoroughly hated my absence from England. The thought of your wretchedness makes me so wish to feel near to you. I pray with all my heart that you may be spared it; but Sydney's letters, and one from Lady Shelburne a day earlier, are so alarming that I dread the worst, and the latest account is the least good.

'Your own three letters reached me together at Cawnpore a month ago. The last had made me almost easy, till this mail came in.

'God bless her—my own dearest friend. You have at least the comfort to know that there are few indeed who so deserve it.

'I wish that your oldest friend did not feel so helpless and useless to you. 'C.'

LORD GRANVILLE TO LORD CANNING.

BRUTON STREET, *December* 17, 1859.

'MY DEAR CANNING,—I am really not fit to be your correspondent, and the news I may give you of my poor Marie is not trustworthy, as I cannot help being too much up and too much down, according as she is a little better or a little worse, and this varies so much from day to day, and from hour to hour, that it is impossible to imagine that she is the same person. The notion of possibly losing her for ever is more than I can bear.

'Your vigorous measures on finance, and for the pacification of Oude, are approved by all with whom I have come into contact. I see the *Times* tries to make out inconsistency, which appears to me to be absurd. I have not heard lately anything of *your* health.

'Yours affectionately, G.'

LORD CANNING TO LORD GRANVILLE.

CAMP, DELHI, *January* 1, 1860.

'MY DEAR GRANVILLE,—What a joy it is to wish you and your dear wife a happy New Year with a whole heart. Your last letter (from Herrnsheim) almost frightened me with the sudden joyful news; but other letters confirmed it, and although I have not heard of your leaving Herrnsheim, I think of you in Bruton Street, once more

happy. Give her my very best love. How I should like to drop in this evening.

'Wilson is with me in camp. He will be very useful, and I like him better than I did in London, though there I always thought him unduly abused. He is enchanted with everything he has seen up country, especially with the busy thriving appearance of the people of the soil, though this one spot, Delhi, is an exception. He is less doctrinaire than when he delivered himself of his Sheffield speeches.[1]

'Lady Canning has come out as an orator. I send you her speech to the 35th Regiment, delivered with complete success from horseback in front of nearly 4,000 troops. She is rather proud of it.

'Ever, my dear G.,

'Yours affectionately, C.'

LADY CANNING TO LORD GRANVILLE.

GOVERNOR-GENERAL'S CAMP, *February* 1, 1860.

'MY DEAR LORD GRANVILLE,—We are anxiously looking for your next letter, and in about three days it ought to arrive.

'The last account was anything but a happy one, and I fear you were still nearly as full of fears as hope. We had been so delighted with the sudden and wonderful change for the better. The first news of this, happily for us, came with the very bad account and gave us good hope. But we have thought of you so very much, and grieved over your torturing ups and downs, and the different opinions the doctors so torment you with.

'I wrote to Lady Granville by the last mail, and will write again soon, for it may amuse her a little to hear of us, and I am always thinking about her. How very touching her patience and gentleness is in all her suffering. It must break one's heart to see her so subdued, and so different from her joyous busy way of old times.

'I am always thinking now that in next year we hope to be with you all again, and it is so very pleasant to think it so near. This tour is evidently a very useful and successful affair, and it is well worth its cost. Mr. Wilson even is loud in this sense; but the cost is nothing so very great.

'The durbars have been very successful. You may be incredulous, but the native chiefs are all charmed with the Governor-General's very pleasant, gracious reception. I heard so much about this over and over again that I was very anxious to know what they had seen before, and in what consisted the difference, and I now believe they used to be received with a sort of cold haughty manner which must have

[1] Mr. James Wilson was appointed Finance Minister in India in 1859.

been very wonderful, and a very odd interpretation of dignity. Lord Hastings in his journal seems always to have prided himself on the impression he made by his enchanting manners. I shall have to write a memoir for Canning in the same style—he is not likely to do it for himself.

'I suppose the speeches he has made to the principal people are always sent home; they have been a great delight to the receivers of them, and I believe there is some novelty in them, for durbars have been often only most empty shows; but there are often cruel heart-burnings after difficult questions of precedence—one poor man said he had not eaten since he knew another Rajah was decidedly allowed to walk before him.

'These weary ceremonies are all but over; still the largest of all is impending at Lahore, where they say five hundred Sirdars claim to be received. 'Ever yours sincerely,

'C. CANNING.'

While Lord Granville was in Germany, events had been marching apace in Italy, and peace had at length been signed at Zürich on November 20. Soon after the return of Lord Granville from Herrnsheim, the Cabinet agreed that as the Treaty of Zürich had evidently not settled the Italian question, but had only still further unsettled it, Lord John Russell might now propose that France and Austria should agree not to intervene for the future by force of arms in Italy; that the Emperor of the French should concert with the Pope for the eventual evacuation of Rome by the French garrison; and that Sardinia should not move any forces across the frontiers of the smaller States, until a vote had been taken as to their future destiny in conventions summoned for that purpose, when peace had been definitely signed. The Emperor of the French meanwhile continued to urge the necessity of a Congress to confirm the peace, and if necessary to deal with the Italian situation as a whole. Tuscany had formally tendered her annexation to Sardinia on September 3: the Romagna on the 24th. A large part of the Treaty stipulations evidently would be a dead letter unless Austria intervened. After another severe struggle in the Cabinet, Lord Palmerston and Lord John Russell consented unwillingly to enter the proposed Congress. They had hitherto opposed this course, but

probably now foresaw that the Congress would never meet. Austrian intervention by force of arms to resist any further extension of the Northern Italian Kingdom—by whatsoever name it was in future to be known—was threatened; and Lord Palmerston and Lord John Russell were prepared to join France in resisting it by force of arms.[1] Not so, however, their colleagues, who were again supported by the Queen.

THE PRINCE CONSORT TO LORD GRANVILLE.

WINDSOR CASTLE, *December* 4, 1859.

'MY DEAR LORD GRANVILLE,—Your excellent account of Lady Granville's health has given us the greatest pleasure.

'In politics the moment is a most important one, and the responsibility of the Cabinet will be great.

'Lord John has in a correspondence with the Queen avowed that he contemplates the possibility of a joint war with France against Austria. The Queen has declared her determination not to participate in the Italian quarrel under any pretence, and to preserve to her people the blessing of peace and neutrality. Lord John now gives a more detailed explanation as to the contingencies under which he thinks *war* our duty: (1) "If Austria should try to regain her supremacy in Italy by arms" (!); (2) against France and Sardinia (!) "if they should coax Venetia into insurrection and then make war on Austria."

'If war is to be renewed at all in any way, Lord John's notion is that "Great Britain cannot a second time be neutral without really abandoning her position" (!) 'Ever yours truly,

'ALBERT.'

OSBORNE, 5. 12. 1859.

'The Queen has been again much troubled by a letter from the Prime Minister to Count Persigny urging the Emperor's consent to the annexation of the Duchies to Sardinia, which we know to be the *casus belli* for Austria. This after the despatch to Lord Cowley, which was the result of long consultations with him and of debate in the Cabinet and correspondence with the Sovereign, is almost inexplicable, but places us on the brink of a catastrophe. Lord John has been asked to read a letter to the Cabinet, showing the road to which Lord John's and Lord Palmerston's steps are systematically leading, viz. *war*. This war (a child may see) must lead to our

[1] *Parliamentary Papers*, lxvii. 148–151; Walpole, *History of Twenty-five Years*, i. 266; *Life of Lord Palmerston*, v. 165; Martin, *Life of the Prince Consort*, iv. 507.

being the allies of France in her attack on the Rhine, should Germany not abandon Austria a second time, and this is giving the Emperor the whole game into his hands, and placing us, when he shall have become master of Europe, at his mercy.

'Ever yours truly, A.'

The crisis was again serious.

'Nothing [Lord Granville wrote to Lord Palmerston in the opening days of 1860] would give me greater pleasure than to help you to smooth matters on Tuesday; but, in order to accomplish this, I trust that the proposition to pledge ourselves to give material aid in certain cases will be made in a manner such as to leave it open for discussion on its merits, and subject to modification. I left the last Cabinet before it was quite over, and have had no communication with anyone since; but I believe that while many of the Cabinet entertain insuperable objections to our engaging ourselves to give material assistance, all or nearly all are ready to agree to great moral support to France and to strong moral pressure upon Austria in order to prevent armed interference in Italy; in short, that independent and unfettered policy by which Lord John has hitherto succeeded in preventing Italy from being bullied either by France or Austria.'[1]

For the moment the policy advocated by the Queen again prevailed; but the break-up of the Government was perhaps permanently averted only by the almost melodramatic change which at this juncture took place in Paris, where the struggle between the reactionary and the Liberal party in the Emperor's councils had reached the breaking point. On December 22, 1859, appeared the famous pamphlet, *Le Pape et le Congrès*, and on January 4, 1860, M. Thouvenel replaced M. Walewski at the Foreign Office. For the moment the rupture between the Emperor and the reactionary party was complete. Cavour again became Prime Minister in Sardinia, and on January 17, 1860, Lord John Russell launched the famous despatch on the affairs of Italy, which Cavour was said to have declared to be worth a dozen victories in the field. By the terms of that despatch, the most famous of the series which Count Brunnow described as 'not diplomacy but blackguardism,' France and Austria were both invited not to intervene by force in the affairs of

[1] Lord Granville to Lord Palmerston, January 7, 1860.

Italy. The Emperor of the French, it was suggested, should come to an understanding with the Pope for the early evacuation of the States of the Church; the people of the States of Central Italy should once more express by the vote of the Assemblies which they had elected whether they desired union with Piedmont; and Europe should recognise as binding and final whatever might be the result of the vote thus taken. The assent of France was now a foregone conclusion, and Austria shrank back alarmed from the risk of a further conflict, in which she might have found Great Britain in alliance with France, although Lord John Russell's despatch had not been allowed by the Cabinet to contain any positive promise of material assistance.

LORD GRANVILLE TO LORD CANNING.

BRIGHTON, *January* 17, 1860.

'MY DEAR CANNING,—I cannot say how much touched I was by your truly affectionate letter. I do not remember whether my last letter was a cheerful or a gloomy one. . . . I find the constant railing up and down fatiguing.

'We had two exciting Cabinets. Johnny, backed by Pam, by Gladstone, and partially by Milner Gibson, Somerset, and Argyll, proposed to pledge ourselves to France that we would give material assistance to France if Austria used force in Italy. Cardwell and Elgin, as usual, gave no opinion. The rest of us objected strongly. The Cabinet adjourned for a week. Pam circulated a violent memorandum, well reasoned in parts, asserting implicit confidence in the Emperor, and ending by recommending Johnny's proposal as the only honourable course for this country. He also wrote to several of us, telling us that Johnny would resign, and that he entirely agreed with Johnny. We, without concert, wrote the same sort of firm answers.

'I went down to the second Cabinet, armed with a beautiful speech and the resolution of a Cato. Johnny read an irrelevant letter from Augustus Loftus, and said: "I think, therefore, without departing from anything which I said the other day, that our best course will now be to ask the Emperors of the French and of Austria whether they would not both agree to abstain from armed interference in Italy." The relief on some of the countenances, particularly that of Jock Campbell, was amusing.

'You seem to be carrying everything before you both in India and at home. 'Yours, G.'

While the last stages of the great drama in Central Italy were thus being played, Lord Granville saw the shadow of death, which he had so long felt hovering near, at last enter his home. Early in March, Lady Granville's illness again became serious.

'My dear Canning [he wrote], I can only write one word to say how deeply I feel the kindness of the two dear letters which I have just received from you and Lady Canning: you will hear from others how little hope I have left.'[1]

A few days more and all was over. Mr. Henry Reeve two years before had noticed Lady Granville in the Sistine Chapel, kneeling at one of the great ceremonies of the Church, and he saw on her face 'the expression of the devout piety which seemed to him the presentiment of an early passage from earth to heaven.' 'With that expression,' he now wrote, 'I see her yet, I shall always see her.'[2] Such was the brief but touching private tribute of a great English journalist, who was also a personal friend. For a larger circle M. Jean Lemoine recorded in the pages of *Le Journal des Débats* the picture of one who was as much admired in foreign as in English society, 'a lady still young, who to all the gifts of Providence united the treasures of the most amiable qualities and the most solid virtues.' 'Lady Granville,' he wrote, 'is dead, after a long malady, in England, surrounded by her family. Theirs doubtless is the principal loss, but they do not stand alone. On the Continent Lady Granville leaves a numerous domestic circle, of which she was the soul and centre; and she leaves everywhere, but especially in France, where she was born, many friends who comprehend our feelings, who share our regrets, and of whose grief we are satisfied in being the interpreters.'[3]

LORD GRANVILLE TO LORD CANNING.

March 23, 1860.

'MY DEAR CANNING,—You will have heard by the last post that it is all over. I can hardly now realise the truth. You knew her and appreciated her, but the last six months have thrown new lights upon her character and conduct, and I doubt whether a purer,

[1] Lord Granville to Lord Canning, March 15, 1860.

[2] Mr. Henry Reeve to Lord Granville, April 15, 1860.

[3] *Le Journal des Débats*, March 1860.

brighter, truer creature ever left this world. Her courage, patience, and cheerfulness during this trying time have astonished even those who have seen most of death. You should have seen the adoration of all who came near her. I know how little I deserved the happiness which for nearly twenty years she gave me, but this does not soften the blow. No friends will feel it more than you and your dear wife. According to a wish expressed at Herrnsheim, I will send a pencil case to Lady Canning. It was always on her table. I had looked forward so much to our meeting, and now I almost dread it. 'Yours, G.'

Reeling under his great loss and distracted by the bickerings of his colleagues, Lord Granville for a moment contemplated retirement. 'I thought,' he told Lord Canning, 'of giving up my office, but it hardly required the advice of my family, and the recollection of what were her wishes, to make me feel it would be neither right nor wise.'[1] Lord John Russell told him that in work he would find the best antidote to grief, and Lord and Lady Canning's letters which came with words of consolation and encouragement bore the same advice.

LORD JOHN RUSSELL TO LORD GRANVILLE.

PEMBROKE LODGE, *April* 10, 1860.

'MY DEAR GRANVILLE,—I have not written to you since your great affliction, for I was not sure where you might be found. But I now hear that you have returned to London, and are proposing to encounter manfully the duties of life. You are right to do so, though I know by experience how hard it is to sit and feel a mourner among those who have no pain to distract their minds from the immediate object before them.

'God disposes all for the best, and our characters are thus moulded to a form better fitted for another life. I trust your sorrows may be lightened by reflecting on the excellence and the reward of her whom you have lost.

'I remain, my dear Granville, yours very faithfully,

'J. RUSSELL.'

LORD CANNING TO LORD GRANVILLE.

SIMLA, *April* 18, 1860.

'MY DEAR GRANVILLE,—Before I got your last sad letter of the 10th, I knew by the telegraph that all was over, and that your dear suffering wife was released.

[1] Lord Granville to Lord Canning, April 15, 1860.

'God bless and support you, my own dearest friend. I long for the time when we shall be together again; and if you are looking forward to it as I am, perhaps it may be serving as a small bright spot ahead in the gloom.

'I hope you will make exertion to return soon to your work. I am sure it is what she would have wished, and certainly it is your duty.

'Some day, when you are not indisposed to it, write and tell me what your plans are, so far as you have any. I try to make them for you, but I don't succeed. Where shall you be when Parliament is over, and through the autumn? I should like to know that you had some fixed prospect.

'Good-bye, my dear Granville, and believe in the love of your affectionate friend, 'C.'

LADY CANNING TO LORD GRANVILLE.

SIMLA, *April* 19, 1860.

'MY DEAR LORD GRANVILLE,—I must write you one little word, though I can only say what you know, that we have felt for you and thought of you, and how very great our sorrow is. I cannot bear to think that we shall never see that dear kind face or hear that happy voice again, and I had so often thought of her welcome as one of the happiest, pleasantest things to look forward to.

'I am not sure that your pain has been greater in seeing her suffer so hopelessly, than now to believe her at rest; but how changed you must be now such a heavy cloud has passed over you.

'There are no words to comfort such grief as this, and only a long long time can blunt its sharp edge, and then you will feel the pleasure to think of the very happy life she passed with you, and in her devoted affection.

'The very day (April 3) when I heard how hopeless it was, I received the most dear kind little letter from *herself*, in her old hand and style, and for a moment thought the bad report could not be true, but it was of a date a month before. I shall keep it as a great prize, and as a farewell of one of the most real and affectionate friends I have ever had.

'I have just had a great disappointment in hearing that Canning must return in a fortnight to Calcutta, as Sir J. Outram is too ill to continue to be President. Canning has only had *one week here*! he felt the heat in camp last week dreadfully, for by day the tents were not bearable; it left him dreadful brow ague like tic, and every day for a week he has had a few hours in agony. He is well now, and recovering from the deafening and uncomfortable sensations left by taking so much quinine. He has some heavy work, but this perfect

climate would have lightened his work. It is a hard case, such as none of his predecessors have had. He will not let me join him till the time originally intended in the rains, about July.

'Good-bye, my dear Lord Granville, and think of Canning and me as your most really affectionate friends. 'C. CANNING.'

The effort was made, and the manful resolution recommended by his friends was taken.

'I am glad [Mr. Charles Greville wrote] you have made it, and have returned to what you may well call your *desolate* home—desolate it is indeed, for it has lost its animating spirit, and there is no consolation for the sad thought that we shall never hear again the voice which filled it with cheerfulness and joy. After yourself, nobody has, I think, so much reason as I have to deplore this irreparable loss. I have lived more than ten years under your roof, during which time she was more than a sister to me; her kindness was unceasing and never varied, and to her I owe all I have enjoyed of comfort and happiness for all those past years, so that I must be the most insensible and ungrateful of creatures if I did not feel it with all the bitterness of grief and as the most grievous of bereavements. In this instance, at least, society will not be unjust, and will render its due homage to her transcendent merits; but while regretting what it has itself lost, it can be but imperfectly aware of the virtues and endearing qualities which those who were nearest to her could alone fully comprehend and estimate. God bless you, and give you courage and resignation to bear the weight of the blow that has fallen upon you.'[1]

Lady Granville was buried at Aldenham.

'After that sad, sad day [Lord Granville wrote to Lord Canning], I went to Paris, Versailles, and Munich, to see some of the relations whom Marie loved the most. I wished particularly to see the young girl who, by her betrothal to Johnny, gave so much happiness to Marie's last days, notwithstanding the feeling which possessed my poor wife that she would not live to see the marriage.[2] Her pure and noble character threw off everything that was base and contaminating. She told me some little time before her end that for three years she had been endeavouring to prepare herself for sudden death. Nobody has ever been more free from ostentation, and it is only since her death that I really know what she was in life.'[3]

[1] Mr. C. Greville to Lord Granville, undated.

[2] Sir John Acton was about to marry a Bavarian lady, the daughter of Count Arco-Valley.

[3] Lord Granville to Lord Canning, April 15, 1860.

CHAPTER XIV

THE DEATH OF LORD AND LADY CANNING

1860–1862

THE remainder of the session of 1860, if undisturbed by differences in the Cabinet on questions of foreign policy, saw a crisis in the relations of the two Houses of Parliament which placed Lord Granville as leader of the Liberal party in the Upper House in a position even more difficult than that which he had experienced during the debates on the Wensleydale Peerage. Among the financial proposals which Mr. Gladstone placed before the House of Commons in the Budget was the repeal of the paper duty, and a Bill with that object was carried through the House of Commons after a protracted struggle. That it would be thrown out by the House of Lords soon became matter of common knowledge. Of such a rejection the disorganisation of the Budget was the least serious result, for the far graver question of the right of the House of Lords to throw out a Money Bill was thereby raised. The situation was further complicated by the fact that Lord Palmerston was known to be indifferent to the proposals of Mr. Gladstone on the subject, and, contrary again to the wishes of Mr. Gladstone, had decided to propose a large scheme of fortifications, necessitating heavy taxation. On this subject the opinions of the Chancellor of the Exchequer and of Lord Palmerston were in violent antagonism—an antagonism which, by its disturbing effect on the Cabinet, largely neutralised the good effect of their recent success in obtaining the signature on January 4, 1860, of the commercial treaty with France generally associated with the name of Mr. Cobden. Lord Granville, notwithstanding his indifference

to commercial treaties in principle, had to be the official defender of it in the House of Lords.[1]

The speech in which Lord Granville introduced the measure for the repeal of the paper duty into the House of Lords greatly enhanced his reputation, but the result of the debate was a foregone conclusion, and the Bill was rejected.[2] The Budget for the year had in consequence to be remodelled. For the moment the House of Commons and the Government were satisfied with recording an assertion of the rights of the Lower House in matters of taxation, and the real struggle was adjourned till next year. Meanwhile financial questions were giving equal trouble in India, where Mr. Wilson had entered on the task of restoring order into the chaos occasioned by the Mutiny, but was meeting with unexpected difficulties from the opposition of another great authority on taxation, Sir Charles Trevelyan, the Governor of Madras.

LORD CANNING TO LORD GRANVILLE.

DEHREE, *May* 17, 1860.

'MY DEAR GRANVILLE,—Just before leaving Simla I got your letter written from Dover. The few lines, sad as they were, were very welcome. I hope that before long—as soon as you can do so without new pain—you will tell me something of your plans.

'I long to hear that you are at your duty again, and I wish I knew what your thoughts are for the time when Parliament and business will be over. Do try not to think of our meeting again with pain. It cannot be the joyous one it would have been; still I look forward to it perhaps more eagerly than ever; and every day is bringing it sensibly nearer.

'You will probably have seen Wood before this reaches you, and he will have told you that my expected three months in the hills have been cut down to less than three weeks. Outram's illness, compelling him to go to sea, and his refusal to leave his post as long as I was absent, left me no alternative, and the proceedings of Trevelyan have made my presence in Calcutta very necessary. I was not well at Simla—having stayed too long in camp in the plains—or rather having had too great a pressure of work during the last ten days in camp. The heat alone I should not have minded; but

[1] See ch. vi. p. 128, note 2.

[2] *Hansard*, third series, clviii. 1439.

sitting at papers all day in a tent with the thermometer at 98° was rather severe. I rushed up to Simla, but got rather worse than better; and strange to say, now that I am rushing down again, and have been ten or eleven days in the plains at their hottest, I am become quite well again. The doctor is diminishing my quinine daily, and I have never been better.

'I am afraid Trevelyan's *coup* will rather take with some of you in England—barring the insubordination of it, which nothing would excuse were he ten times in the right. His promises of reduction in Madras have been lavishly made for ten months past, and have in no case been executed. I am anxious, of course, about the new taxes, but very confident of carrying them through safely, if not smoothly—that is, on this side of India. I hope the same of Bombay. As to Madras, I do not see how you can expect me to be responsible for anything so long as Trevelyan remains there to sound an opposition to the Government all over India. What he has done in taxes to-day he may do in Army matters to-morrow. The mischief reaches (by means of this unwarrantable publication of his minutes) all over India.

'Before this reaches you, Wood will, I hope, have determined what to do. I have told him what in my opinion ought to be done.

'Wilson has done his work excellently, *in substance*. But he is too fond of parading House of Commons and Treasury precedents; and this gives his speeches (of which he is too fond) an appearance of English doctrinaire-ism which injures the measures he advocates. It disposes our own English officers against them quite as much as it fails to convince the natives. I have no doubt of being able to keep him out of this when I get down to Calcutta. He is a little vain of the splash he has made, but not offensively so. He is really a good and honest fellow.

'Good-bye, my dearest friend. I long to see your handwriting again. 'Your affectionate C.

'You will be amused at Lady Canning. I left her at Simla organising an expedition against Thibet. She has two A.D.C.s, a doctor, a maid, and the civil officer of Simla (Giffard's brother, Lord William Hay), as her staff, and they start in a few days northwards over the mountains. She will probably be about five weeks on the march, and will not return to the plains until the rains have set in.

'C.'

On March 26, 1859, Sir Charles Trevelyan had stated his opinion in writing adversely to the plan of finance proposed by Mr. James Wilson; and having obtained the assent of his own Council, he then published the minute on his own

responsibility, without communicating either with the Legislative Council of India or the Home Government. This conduct on his part was considered to be subversive of all authority, and at once received the attention of the Cabinet. 'We had a Cabinet yesterday on Trevelyan,' Lord Granville wrote to Lord Canning; 'Sir Henry Ward will succeed him.'[1]

The question of the appointment of Lord Canning's own successor was also engaging attention, for the term of office usually held by a Governor-General was drawing to a close.

'It is my wish [Lord Canning wrote in February] to carry through the Bill for reforming the Executive Council this summer, so that I may put it in operation in the autumn; and that you will relieve me in March, or soon after. If you cannot carry the Bill through until 1861, I should desire to remain in India long enough to give effect to it; that would be, probably, for five or six months beyond the passing of the Bill. I do not know that I can say anything to make my views and wishes clearer. I will only add that they will be cheerfully surrendered, if you or Lord Palmerston think it necessary that this should be done.'[2]

These considerations became the subject of discussion between him and Lord Granville. The names of Lord Elgin and Sir John Lawrence were uppermost at home as possible successors.

LORD CANNING TO LORD GRANVILLE.

CALCUTTA, *May* 29, 1860.

'MY DEAR GRANVILLE,—Since I wrote on the way to Calcutta, I have received your letter written after your return to London. Many, many thanks for it, my dearest friend. It tells me so much which it is a real pleasure to read from your hand, and which you alone can tell me. Deep as is your affliction, it is impossible, even for those who love you best, to think of her passage through those last trials without something of a happier feeling than one of mere comfort. I am so glad that you have not persevered in thinking of giving up

[1] Lord Granville to Lord Canning, May 27, 1860. Sir Henry Ward, after a long parliamentary career, was made High Commissioner of the Ionian Islands and held that post from 1849 to 1855. He was Governor of Ceylon from 1855 to 1860, when he was appointed Governor of Madras; but he died of cholera almost immediately on landing, on August 2, 1860.

[2] Lord Canning to Lord Granville, February 16 1860.

your office, but I am rather haunted by what you before said of your dread of our meeting.

'I send (in case Wood should not show it you) a letter which I have written to him regarding my leaving India. The only contingency which would make me remain willingly (I do not mean cheerfully) beyond my time is stated there. I did not dream that it could arise until a week ago. It is the postponement of the measure for changing the Executive Government of India from councillors to secretaries. This will have so important a bearing upon the position of the Governor-General by increasing his avowed and legal responsibility and authority, and concentrating these upon himself, that I could not patiently see it introduced immediately after I had left the country; which would be the case if the Bill were not brought in until next session, and if I were to return in March of next year, as I have looked forward to do.

'Such a sequence as this change coming immediately after I had laid down the Government, would be much more unbearable than the condemnation of any act or policy of which the Government at home might disapprove, however strongly. Against such snubs I can defend myself; or if I can't, it is my own fault; but against a seeming slight such as this I should be powerless. Nor would any explanation, written or spoken by the Home Government, clear me of it. The plain fact would stand out, not only in the newspapers of the day, but in history, that my departure from India had been chosen as the occasion for the change. It would not be known that the change was mainly in accordance with views and recommendations of my own, because these have been given to the Home Government (so far as the Executive Council is concerned) in private letters to Wood and Stanley. But it would appear in the narratives of the last three years that much of my work had been done away from my Council; and this would rather provoke the inference that there might have been reason for postponing the change till I was gone. I know that nothing of this is meant. And yet I do not feel that I am over-sensitive upon it. What do you think? My true wish is exactly as I have summed it up to Wood. Pray do all that can be done to get the Bill passed this session.

'Who is to be my successor if I return whilst the Government is in? If Elgin, he will sail with the wind, and a great deal of good is to be done in India by keeping on that tack, so long as the passions of men are not up. If John Lawrence, he will go far towards upsetting in a year or two all that I hope to have accomplished in my last three years, both in Oude and in the Punjab. He will not do it by direct means—I can make that very difficult to any man—but by

giving a cold shoulder to all measures for increasing the consequence of, and placing trust in, the native chiefs and gentry *generally* (for even he has his particular favourites amongst them), and by his name, the very announcement of which as Governor-General would make more than half of the Civil officers in the Punjab—and even in Oude—pause in their new zeal. A shrug or a sneer from the incoming Governor-General pointed at some unhappy sirdar or talookdar who had blundered in his duties, would be a signal for consigning the whole class once more to snubs and obstructions, although the system might remain undisturbed on paper, so far as the Home Government knew anything about it.

'Sidney Herbert would be the best of all the men I know, but he thought me a fool for my pains in going, and he would not be likely to take a different view of himself in like circumstances. Newcastle, if he were not so ludicrously unlucky (I don't mean to be unfeeling), would have merits. A duke would be popular, for a time, with the Calcutta-ites. The work is not, generally, trying to the temper, though very much so to one's patience and endurance. He would be sure to treat the natives like gentlemen. They worship a red beard. Would Argyll come? I suppose not. The *domus et placens* (very *placens*) *uxor* would be too strong a discouragement.

'I am not one bit the worse for the hot journey down country—infinitely better than I was at Simla. There for a fortnight I was taking sixty grains of quinine a day. Here, and while on the road, the doctor has gradually reduced it to four grains.

'Ever, my dear Granville,

'Your affectionate friend, C.'

CALCUTTA, *June* 3, 1860.

'MY DEAR GRANVILLE,—By the last mail from London (May 3) I see that Wood has heard of Trevelyan's minute, and the minutes of the Members of his Council, having been published—but not how they were published. He therefore does not know the worst. The suspense of not knowing what will be done with Trevelyan is getting to be embarrassing—rather more so than I expected; but there is nothing for it but to wait patiently till I hear.

'I see that Wood means to separate the reform of the Legislative Council from that of my Executive Council, and to make two Bills of these measures; also that the first of the two is at an end for this session. I don't mind this much if only he will carry through the second. Upon this matter I remain of the same mind as when I last wrote to you.

'Lord Clyde sails to-morrow. He has been much irritated for the last week by the attacks made upon him in the newspapers for

having (as is assumed) said in some minute or letter that there is no officer of the local army fit to command an English regiment. He never said it. The nearest approach to it is his having written, in answer to a call for his opinion as to how the generalships of divisions had best be apportioned between local and line officers, to the effect that a certain proportion more favourable than heretofore to the latter ought to be adopted, because of the importance of having English regiments inspected by generals who were used to them. This has been perverted into the above charge, and has been so worked up by the press that it has visibly affected the feelings of the local army's officers towards him at parting; and he has done his best to aggravate this by holding forth to every first comer upon it. He is not made to bear pen and ink excitement. But he is a brave and noble old man nevertheless, and I grieve at the loss of him.

'Ever affectionately yours, C.'

'Wood,' Lord Canning wrote at this time, 'has worked the India Bills through the Commons like a brick. It is a great thing to get them through, especially the Council Bill —*consensu omnium.*'

But if the India Bills were safe, the struggle over the Paper Duty Bill had to begin again. 'Lord Palmerston wanted to give up the Paper Bill, but the Cabinet would not allow him.' 'The Cabinet,' Lord Granville told Lord Canning in the same letter, was not now 'a very united one.' Lord Palmerston had not got his heart in the contest, and Lady Palmerston openly proclaimed her hope that the Lords would throw the Bill out.[1] Lord Granville, fortunately, agreed with the Premier on the subject of the fortifications, but he supported Mr. Gladstone, as did Lord John Russell, in his determination to insist on the maintenance of the views of the majority of the House of Commons in regard to the paper duty. Thereby he was able once more to play the part of the honest broker. Mr Gladstone had to yield on the question of expenditure; Lord Palmerston as to the paper duty; and in 1861 the Government was able to face the House of Lords with an undivided front.

Recourse was now had to a practice which has since become the established usage, and was not without precedent even at

[1] Lord Granville to Lord Canning, May 10, 1860.

the time. It was determined to include all the financial measures of the year in one Bill, and to give the House of Lords the choice of accepting or rejecting them *en bloc*; the House of Commons by the resolutions of the previous year having defined the financial prerogative of the House of Commons to be inconsistent with the right of amending a Money Bill by the House of Lords as distinct from the right of that House to reject such a Bill. In 1787 Mr. Pitt—as Lord Granville took occasion to remind the House of Lords—had introduced a comprehensive financial scheme founded on no fewer than 3,500 distinct resolutions, and containing a schedule of sixty pages. Objection was then raised in the House of Lords to the measure on account of the multiplicity of the provisions which it contained; the question was fully debated, and on a division the Bill was adopted in the shape in which it stood. Many other precedents of the same kind, Lord Granville pointed out, could be quoted. In regard to the present occasion he urged on the irate peers that it was thought by Lord Palmerston's Government more respectful to the House of Lords, instead of again bringing in the identical proposal which they had rejected as a separate measure, to introduce it coupled with the other portions of the Budget, inasmuch as it 'was more likely to be agreeable to them to consider and adopt it in that form than to deal with it in a manner having anything like the appearance of a retractation of a previous decision.' By these and other sedative arguments, conveyed in conciliatory language, the solid phalanx on the Opposition benches was gradually melted and finally vanished. The Budget Bill was thus eventually returned unaltered to the House of Commons, and the crisis was over.[1]

There had also been differences on the Reform question, and at one moment they were hardly less serious than those on the Paper Duties.

LORD GRANVILLE TO LORD CANNING.

CHISWICK, *June* 11, 1860.

'MY DEAR CANNING,—I thought two days ago that we were breaking up. Gladstone talked at the Cabinet of the necessity of a

[1] *Hansard*, clxiii. 696, 702–3.

substitute; and Johnny told me that if Gladstone went, he should take an early opportunity of following him. On Saturday's Cabinet, however, Johnny himself proposed to abandon the Reform Bill this evening, and Gladstone talked over *future* plans of finance.[1]

'Ben Stanley will probably be the new Postmaster, to the great disgust of the majority of his colleagues, and to the indignation of other aspirants. It is not a vote-catching appointment, but I have no doubt that he is the most useful man in the House of Lords, and in every way is a pleasant colleague and an irritating outsider.

'Yours affectionately, G.'

LORD CANNING TO LORD GRANVILLE.

June 20, 1860.

'MY DEAR GRANVILLE,—I am still in good heart about the taxes. I find less difficulty in moulding the income tax to native usage than I expected. The licence tax is quite easy of management. In Oude and the Punjab, where legal enactment is not required, everything continues to go on swimmingly. There may be a show of resistance here and there in the Regulation Provinces, but I think nothing serious. We shall probably not collect half of what would be due under the strict application of the measure; but that is a small matter, if the measure itself can be brought into first adoption smoothly.

'I see some of the English papers are assuming that an income tax must be here, as in England, one of rigid unbending consistency and sameness all through the country. Nothing of the kind. The modes of assessment, and in great measure the machinery, will vary with every province, if this is found expedient—perhaps with several districts in the same province.

'Wilson continues to be of first-rate use in laying down and working out all the principles and laws of the measure. He is still a little slow—or reluctant, rather—to admit the necessity of variety, and of accommodation to local peculiarities; but with this part of the subject he will have little to do.

'I look for great benefit from his labours on many other matters: a consolidated Revenue Board, a new system of audit of remittances, and the new currency. He is immensely patient and painstaking, and works hard. I am a little afraid of the effect of the rains and damp heats upon him. He is beginning to complain.[2]

[1] Contrary to the wishes of some of the Cabinet, Lord John Russell had introduced a Reform Bill, to which he considered himself bound.

[2] Mr. Wilson died August 11, 1860

'I (like Reeve) have a *santé insolente* at present; but the Council consists of nobody but Frere (Wilson's work being all extra and new matter), and the pressure is severe. I have no hope of Outram's returning in a condition to take up his work again, and I look in vain for signs of that Executive Council "Reform Bill" which Wood is to bring in. The telegram of the mail of May 18 has just come in from Bombay and says nothing of it. Pray stir up the matter.

'I am charmed with Frere, whom I had seen only once before (at Bombay on my way out). He is thoroughly well-conditioned and gentlemanlike—full of information, and with a much less localised mind than that of any high Indian servant I know. So very piano in manner as to be almost priggish, but quite the contrary of this in work and Council. Very good-looking—something like a manly-faced Dufferin with a Vandyke beard.[1]

'Adieu, my dear G. 'Ever your affectionate C.

'P.S.—I don't like this China affair at all. Disaster is not likely, because the material of our force is so good—quite first-rate and well equipped; but I much fear that we shall accomplish nothing final this year; perhaps come to a deadlock for want of larger numbers; look like fools; and have to begin again in the spring of 1861. If there is anything in the world which ought to be done with all one's might—when done at all—it is a war, however little our hearts may be in it.

'What on earth is the meaning of taking so ridiculous a vote as 800,000*l.* for a war in China?'

CALCUTTA, *June* 30, 1860.

'My DEAR GRANVILLE,—Pray look at these missionary amenities.

'Read first the despatch which is printed in the inclosed newspaper extract, which tells the story in short; then read the article in the *Christian* (so-called) *Intelligencer*.

'I see that at a great gathering of the Church Missionary Society at Exeter Hall, on the first of last month, the subject of these papers was brought up, and the facts represented in the missionary colouring, to the indignation of the company. As it is but one step from Exeter Hall to some benches of the House of Lords, perhaps the subject may be broached there too. The despatch has been published in the newspapers here; so that it may be treated as a paper open to all. I wish you to know, and to be able to tell others, the truth of the case. The Bishop here (Cotton) is a sensible well-judging man, but rather timorous.

'I have not heard from you for two mails. By the last (May 26), Wood tells me that he is going to make the change in my Council

[1] Mr. Frere, afterwards Sir Bartle Frere.

this session. This is the best news I have had for a long time. I hope you will have kept him up to his intention.

'Ever yours, C.'

CALCUTTA, *July* 4, 1860.

'MY DEAR GRANVILLE,—I send this *Delhi Gazette* because it shows what has been doing in the Punjab towards giving to the sirdars (i.e. chiefs and landholders, who are our subjects) the status and trust of gentlemen associated with—not severed from—the ruling power of their country. The measure is the same (allowing for local difference and peculiarities) as was adopted in Oude a few months before; but in Oude it was easier. The newness of our rule, and the entire rebellion of the province, followed by the annihilation of the old tenures by confiscation, gave a clear stage in Oude upon which to work out anything that might seem fittest; whereas in the Punjab the deliberate and avowed thrusting aside and lowering of every great family for ten years past (ever since Dalhousie sided with John Lawrence against Henry Lawrence, and forced the latter to leave the Punjab) made it a difficult and ticklish matter to hark back.[1] I could not have done it but for the sort of opportunity which the splash of the march and visit to Lahore furnished. If it had had to be done on paper from Calcutta, it would have been impossible to prevent the appearance of its being an undignified recantation under pressure of recent fears.

'The official correspondence is in the first part of the newspaper. Nothing is more remarkable than the way in which the several Divisional Commissioners—men trained by John Lawrence, and until lately imbued with his sentiments—and *all* able men, have chimed in with the scheme. Montgomery was always rather well-inclined on the question, but fearful of the experiment. But the most curious thing of all is the article which the paper gives upon it. Though a more respectably conducted paper than most in India, it has always taken a truculent anti-Native tone, and is not more friendly to me than the rest of them; yet it speaks favourably of what has been done. In itself this is of no great importance; but if it is an indication that common sense and right feeling are asserting themselves at last—and really I think it may be so interpreted—it is valuable.

'Meanwhile there is plenty of wrong feeling showing itself here in Calcutta, in the quarter where one should least expect it. A Disarming Bill, or rather the continuance and amendment of one, is before

[1] See the *Life of Sir Henry Lawrence*, by Sir Herbert Edwardes and Mr. Herman Merivale, chap. xvii.

the Legislative Council, and, as was to be expected, the fact that it draws no distinction between natives and Europeans is making the Calcutta British public very angry. But the leaders of the agitation are the Queen's judges, Peacock (Chief Justice) and Wells ; and the speeches they have been making in the Council (those of Wells at least) are claptrap. Peacock is honest and in earnest, and very obstinate. Wells, who has never been twenty miles from Calcutta, is sheer bunkum. 'Ever sincerely yours, C.'

LORD GRANVILLE TO LORD CANNING.

16 BRUTON STREET, LONDON, W., *July* 26, 1860.

'MY DEAR CANNING,—I feel very much your kindness in constantly writing to me lately, and it is a great pleasure seeing the cheerful tone with which you look at everything now going on in India. You regret the feeling which I expressed of dreading our meeting. I have found that I was deceiving myself when I said so, for my annoyance was great when I found from your last letter but one that you were likely to stay away another year. So consider what I have to say with the grain of my personal disappointment. There are for your staying the following reasons. It would be for the public good. I doubt any successor being found in any degree to be compared with you; and on several matters, particularly the financial one, the treatment of natives, and the reorganising the administration, your experience will be of great use. The reason which you give as having some weight with you has absolutely none with me, viz. the passing of the Bill next year for the reform of the Executive in India. Charles Wood in his respectful way says "that is a pack of nonsense." This would naturally be his line; but your sister, whose bias is always towards susceptibility, agrees with me.[1] Then there is not the slightest fear of anyone thinking you were clinging to your office.

'The reasons against appear to me to be these, and they are in my opinion vastly preponderant. You have gone through an unparalleled time of difficulty; you have brought it to a successful issue. You have had several warnings as to health, though your constitution has come out of the struggle triumphantly. Who can guarantee you against some difficulty of some sort or another, which you may not have to leave with regret unsettled? Who can pretend that there will not be a thousand things in 1862 which your experience will not enable you to settle better than a new man? You have nearly concluded the specified time. I think you had much better, for your fame, your health, and for your and Lady Canning's

[1] Lady Clanricarde.

social happiness, come back at a time which is cut and dried for you. How many of your friends are already gone! Who can say what havoc another year may make among the remaining?

'Lady Clanricarde tells me that she has given you contrary advice, and her opinion is of immense value. It is against her wishes, and I hardly knew till yesterday how warm her feelings about you were.

'Charles Wood is also of her opinion, but he is entirely guided by his own desire that you should continue to do useful work, and that he should be relieved from the great embarrassment of choosing your successor. If he goes out, Stanley would probably appoint Lawrence; or be obliged to appoint Dizzy, which last, however, you probably would not object to.

'I know Dalhousie attributes his whole breakdown to the extra time he served. Pray consider all this, and do not be led away by the natural temptation of seeing everything you have undertaken brought more or less to a close. A long memorandum ought to enable an intelligent successor to carry out all the personal changes.

'The Government continues as a whole. Gladstone has been on half-cock of resignation for nearly two months. He swallowed the constitutional question, and a compromise was made about the Fortifications. With great want of tact, having swallowed the last camel, he could not get over the gnat of being in the House when Palmerston proposed the scheme. Palmerston has tried him hard once or twice by speeches and Cabinet minutes, and says that the only way to deal with him is to bully him a little, and Palmerston appears to be in the right. I like Gladstone very much, nd have generally taken his part in the Cabinet, but not to the extent which Argyll does. The Duchess of Sutherland is miserable at the attacks made upon him.

'The House of Commons part of the Cabinet look jaded to death, always excepting Palmerston, who stands higher than he did. I know none of his colleagues who have gained much. S. Herbert has, I believe lost ground. G. Lewis holds his. No good young men in either house. I believe Ben will be the new Postmaster. I like Somerset very much. Able, honest, and not vain. The Chancellor is getting old, but, on the whole, is useful both in and out of the Cabinet.[1] I was with the Queen at Osborne on Sunday, very gracious. She talked much about you, was delighted with a very interesting letter, which she showed me, about your Imperial Progress. As soon as Parliament is up, if that ever happens, I shall go to Spain with Pahlen, J. Acton, and Fred. Cavendish.

'Yours affectionately, GRANVILLE.'

[1] Lord Campbell.

16 Bruton Street, London, W., *August* 4, 1860.

'My dear Canning,—In politics nothing very new. The last party fight is to come off on Monday on Paper. I believe that we shall win, and in any case shall not go out.

'I have been calling in vain (and he has called on me) to thank Lord Clyde for all the truth he has been saying in private, and on Thursday in public, about you. He is a regular old brick. I hear he was very nervous, and said once or twice, "God bless me, I have forgotten it." It was really a very handsome and just tribute, very well expressed, as you will see by the reports.

'How far shall you regret the amalgamation of the armies? The Bill will be next week in our House, and will be opposed only by Ellenborough.

'My Spanish plan is rather shaken. The House will not be up till the end of the month. Johnny Acton has thrown us over. . . .

'Your affectionate G.'

Lady Canning to Lord Granville.

Government House, Calcutta, *August* 9, 1860.

'My dear Lord Granville,—I am very much touched at your so kindly thinking of sending me that little remembrance of your dear wife. I shall indeed keep it always. The last thing she gave me I had been so grieved to lose when my tent was burnt; it was a little horse-shoe brooch I almost always wore, and I think it must have been stolen, as no remains were found of it. If you have any really good photograph either from a portrait or from the life, I should so much like to have it. I have only the little French full-lengths of her, and even those were like and natural.

'I came here a fortnight ago, beginning with a cruelly hot journey, for the rains were so late that I got tired of waiting for them, and I only came into them as far down as Cawnpore. After that I had railways and river all the way to Calcutta, and in fact I opened the new unfinished line from the Ganges; for the train which was sent to fetch me from Ranmehal was the first that had run the whole way, and it brought me here in eight hours, and was rather an event.

'I find Canning very well, much better than at Simla. I think it was a very happy thing that he came back. He has liked so much better to be in the midst of his work, and he never takes at all kindly to anything the least like a holiday, and Simla did not suit him at all in any way.

'In this house everyone keeps well, but there is much sickness, and we are very anxious indeed about poor Mr. Wilson. You will know how he is long after this date, as there is a telegraph to Galle;

certainly just now he is in a dangerous state, and his illness is always a most difficult one to treat—it is very bad dysentery. The doctor has moved him into his own house, and is unceasing in his care of him. He knows exactly what his state is, and bore it well when he asked the doctors to tell him plainly what they thought. Even if he recovers he must go to sea and cease to work. He is a great loss, especially just now; and he has always seemed to me to be the only man whose work seemed to be a real relief and help to Canning, and he has almost always done so very well. We have really liked him, and Canning feels his state as a great distress.

'What a grievous loss there is too in poor Sir H. Ward.

'I hope nothing will prevent this from being our last year here. I think I get more and more impatient to be back amongst all one cares for, and do not in the least respond to Lord Dalhousie's parting wish—viz. that we should leave India with as much regret as he did!

'I hope you have seen dear old Lord Clyde; I think he must be charmed at having the Coldstreams given to him. He grew terribly unpopular here at last owing to his writings upon Indian officers. Sir H. Rose makes himself very agreeable, and has had no great opportunity as yet of proclaiming any opinions; so his popularity has not yet diminished. He is living in one of the bungalows in the park at Barrackpore, and now and then comes here for a day or two. I think he has given up all thoughts of Simla this year.

'Certainly Canning is better this year than he ever has been before in India. 'Believe me, yours very sincerely,

'C. CANNING.'

LORD GRANVILLE TO LORD CANNING.

16 BRUTON STREET, LONDON, W., *August* 24, 1860.

'MY DEAR CANNING,—Nothing particular to tell you. The Indian Loan Bill has gone off quietly. Haroun al Raschid has called upon me, but I have not seen him.[1] Lord Clyde keeps himself quiet, and struck Johnny Acton as young and cheery at the Athenæum. Our labours come to an end on Tuesday. The session has been a dull one, and not very creditable to the Government or to the House of Commons; but everything has been done, excepting the Bankruptcy Bill, which people really wished for, and much has been left undone which nobody wished for.

'Palmerston is decidedly the most powerful man in the country, and I doubt his losing his present prestige till his strength fails him, unless we have a succession of bad harvests, which this one now

[1] The allusion is apparently to Lord Stratford de Redcliffe.

promises to be. Heartrending work to see magnificent crops everywhere rotting on the ground. Trade also is more slack.

'Manchester complains of your legislation. Ben is in the seventh Heaven at your old shop in the City.[1] He has begun his career by a violent quarrel with Argyll, whom I am inclined to believe to be wrong; but Ben has mixed up Gladstone, who had nothing to do with the cause of the row, i.e. throwing open to unlimited competition the carriers, the day before Ben was appointed.

'Shelburne is enjoying great dignity, but not much ease, from his success as Chairman of the Great Western. He is looking well. . . . Pahlen, after complaining bitterly of my parliamentary delays, announced himself for Monday, the day before the prorogation, and says that several days in London are indispensable.[2] . . .

'I go to Aldenham to-morrow. It is an effort, but one which I wish to make. 'Yours affectionately, G.'

LONDON, *January* 24, 1861.

'MY DEAR CANNING,—I am so grateful for the Himalaya stuff. First of all, it is quite charming in itself; secondly, a little *souvenir* from you is very pleasant; and thirdly, it gives me a starting-point to write from. I was beginning to get oppressed after the long pause, by the feeling which one has about the necessity of writing at great length when one writes so far. I do not believe that I have written to you since I despatched a fine argumentative epistle against your remaining any longer in India. I tried the same argument to Lord Clyde, who stopped me with: "Lord Canning owes another page to history, my Lord." I do not pretend to be convinced, but I bow to your own judgment of what you think right.

'I went to Spain for two months with Pahlen and Fred. Cavendish, two very different but pleasant companions. We entered Spain by Perpignan to Barcelona, steamed from there to Valencia, railed to Madrid, visited the royal palaces, Segovia and Toledo; diligenced to Granada, rode (el Señorito and I) to Cordova, railed to Seville and Cadiz, steamed to Gibraltar; rode all of us to Ronda, where we parted, and I returned alone through Spain. The weather was magnificent all the time. I never met with any discomfort, excepting the night work in the diligence, and I cannot call to mind

[1] Lord Canning had been Postmaster-General in Lord Aberdeen's Government, the office now held by Lord Stanley of Alderley, who had succeeded Lord Elgin on the appointment of the latter to China.

[2] Count Nicholas Pahlen was a well-known figure in London society. He was the younger son of the Count Pahlen, one of the nobles who removed the Emperor Paul. Owing to his Liberal opinions he was not *bien vu* by the authorities in Russia; and, except during the Crimean War, lived principally in England and in France. He died at a great age at Nice.

anything which did not far exceed my expectations. Several things, the Gallery at Madrid, Granada, and Seville, each separately worth the whole journey. I learned sufficient Spanish to make myself intelligible to an intelligent, patient person, and drove the whole stock of Italian out of my head. I presume you will not either of you be much given to foreign travelling after your return, or I should propose myself as a *cicerone*. Since my return I have been chiefly in London. Two days at Trentham, at Bowood, at Rushmore, and at Tottenham. You will have heard of the Duke of Sutherland's dangerous illness—paralysis. He is better, but I am afraid that it is the beginning of the end. She is very low, and has given up the "robes." I do not know who is to be her successor. She is full of Lady Waterford, whom we saw at Dunrobin. She confided her admiration to Marochetti, who answered prettily enough, "Oui, c'est un grand homme et une femme charmante." At Bowood the old Marquis was remarkably well, and I thought less deaf, but walking with him in frosty weather was chilly. Lady Shelburne well, proud and occupied with her three children.

'Sidney Herbert is ill. His own family would have advised him to stay in the Commons, and resign his office. I hear that the latter is in great disorder, and wants a thorough reorganisation. I have long been of opinion that the Horse Guards and the War Office are incompatible institutions, but any change would kill the Queen. Palmerston is stronger than ever, both in health and in political position. John Russell asked to be made a peer, but Palmerston would not part with him, a proof that he thinks himself very safe. China has been an enormous piece of luck for us. It might have been a great scrape. Your arrangements seem to have been perfect. The Spider is in a scrape about the 500,000*l.* I was told, not by him, that it was the Queen who had insisted upon it as due to her honour.[1]

'I have undertaken, together with Chandos, Tom Baring, Fairbairn, and Dilke, the management of a new Exhibition in 1862. I was much averse to it, and Charles Greville and all my friends predict it will be a great failure. It is impossible to argue the other way; but I believe it will be an absolute success, not a comparative one. I am afraid you will be too *pompous* for the head of the jurors, and it is difficult to do without some. Pray stir up your people to send us a good Exhibition. We will forward to you an official request, as soon as we get our charter. There are some fearful contingencies.

[1] The vote originally proposed for the China expedition had been judged insufficient by both the Queen and Lord Canning, and was increased from 800,000*l.* to 1,300,000*l.*

War in Europe—another bad season—failure of cotton crop. What is going on in America is wonderfully interesting. It has quite wiped out the Prince's visit, which was a great success, besides introducing a good feeling between the two countries.[1] It has also been useful to Newcastle, relieving him of his own notion of his being unlucky. 'Yours affectionately, G.'

CHISWICK, *February* 24, 1861.

'MY DEAR CANNING,—The Speaker has been making great play in Rotten Row with your story about the friend who called on you upon an elephant bought fifty years ago, but which was still very fresh on his legs. He is at this moment rather *sanguinely despondent*, as one of your great predecessors said.

'There is a clever article in the *North British*, an exaggerated encomium on Palmerston, in which, looking for a successor, the writer can find no one but you. There are few things I should like better than a Secretaryship of State under you. I wonder what will be your political attitude when you come back. I do not know at all, whether you would prefer for a short time unbounded rest and idleness, or whether you would be ready to buckle to at once. Our position is precarious, depending entirely upon Palmerston's popularity among the Tories, and a certain unwillingness on the part of the Radicals to turn out a Ministry which has Gladstone for Chancellor of the Exchequer. The unpopularity of the latter among all other sections of political parties is stronger than ever.

'Herbert's success, *quoiqu'en disent quelques journaux*, has been complete. Nothing could be more agreeable to our House than his light agreeable gentlemanlike manner.

'Newcastle looks ill, but not so ill as Herbert. Newcastle's pomp has certainly much increased by the American journey. I shall stipulate that our umpires are not to look at him for a week before they pronounce judgment on you, lest it should falsify their standard.

'We have been in a peck of troubles since I wrote about the Exhibition: Paxton writing an insidious letter to the *Times* (after a distinct promise of warm support), hitting us between wind and water, just at the moment we required signatures to the Guarantee Fund. We are, however, succeeding with the latter, and have ordered a building, designed by Captain Fowke and Cole; but from which we have been obliged, to our great regret, to excise a great Hall, which would have been the eighth wonder of the world. Pam is as adverse to us as he was in 1851.

'News came of Eglinton's death (not true). Oswald got excited,

[1] In 1860–1 the Prince of Wales had visited the United States of America, accompanied by the Duke of Newcastle.

and announced to Jem Howard that he should go straight to Palmerston, demand the Lord-Lieutenancy not as a favour but as a right, and refuse to leave the room till he had an answer. The latter he would soon have got, and I believe there is still sufficient vigour left in Pam's gouty toe to kick poor Oswald out of the room. 'Yours ever, G.'

LORD CANNING TO LORD GRANVILLE.

CALCUTTA, *March* 3, 1861.

'MY DEAR GRANVILLE,—I was very glad to get your letter. I don't know which of us has been longest in debt. I believe I have, but with no excuse for it—none at least that would be intelligible. The question of my stay here is past discussion; and the face of affairs has changed so much that that which was my chief inducement in the summer has become quite a minor one; for a reform of the Executive, to which then I attached most importance, is now much less pressing than a reform of the legislative machinery. Yet I think that I was right in my first reasons for staying; and, at all events, what has since happened in other branches of government, military and finance especially, has made my stay to be even more of a duty than I then thought it. But it is already very irksome—if that is any triumph to you: I find myself thinking how pleasant it would be if, according to rule, I were steaming westward; and I have not the zest in my work that I had even last year. I am as well as possible, and not the least afraid of the hot season, but I believe I want rest.

'I don't feel up to engaging you for Spain in 1862. I have seen all you describe, except Cordova and Toledo, but I should not much care to go there again. I wonder whether you admired the Escurial sufficiently. It is too grim and severe to be called handsome, but I know nothing more grandiose. The dwelling of a single man expanded into almost a city, and so solid and massive.

'I think your Exhibition for 1862 a mistake. I do not believe that advances in arts and manufactures have been sufficiently marked to be appreciated by the common herd, and to be successful you must make impression upon them. Nor has there been time for them to forget 1851, and they will judge you relatively, do what you will. The best that I see to be said of it is that it is a palpable announcement that you are resolved and expect to keep the peace. As to India, we shall make a bad show. All ornamental and attractive manufactories have received a great blow, and are far from recovered. At Delhi little is doing, at Lucknow nothing that would have any interest. Madras will probably send you most. It

was outside the storm, and Harris took great pains with the Exhibition there. In Upper India they say that they received no benefit from the Exhibition of 1851, and that many things sent to Paris in 1855 were lost. Then the want of the India House will be felt. Wood will see us all somewhere before he will undertake to help as the East India Company did. Indeed, he could not do it. I will look into the course taken in 1851, and let you know in due time what to expect for 1862. As to the jury, I wish you may catch me. Not that pomposity would be any disqualification after the distinguished services which Baron Charles Dupin was able to render in that capacity.

'I was surprised at Herbert's move, but I think he was very right to go to the House of Lords with office rather than to stay in the House of Commons without. To remain in the House of Commons in such a position would have been no rest in the long run. Where is Lea?[1] Is it a pleasant place?

'Lady Canning is ploughing the sands of the Ganges about 300 miles above Calcutta. I left her in the camp about a month ago, and made a flying visit in a carriage drawn and pushed by twelve coolies through some jungly country to Lucknow and other places, and then came down to Calcutta by road. Lady Canning went with the camp till they reached the Ganges and then embarked; but the river was never so low in the memory of the oldest inhabitant, and the last I heard of her was that the yacht was fairly embedded in a sandbank, and that the country had turned out to dig her out. Luckily the vessel is very comfortable, and it will not be very hot up there for some time to come. But I have no hope of seeing her arrive here for ten days to come.

'As to public matters. Financially, I hope and believe we shall make both ends meet without any borrowing except what Wood will take for railways. Militarily, I expect a great deal of trouble and vexation in carrying out the amalgamation scheme, and in supplying its deficiencies or modifying it; and by the time that is done, or before it, you will have settled what changes are to be made in the legislative system. This will be another heavy job to be finished off before I pack up, but it is one which I could not with an easy conscience have run away from, and left to my successor. It has become much more full of difficulties since the class asperities of last summer were fomented by the judges. As to more purely native

[1] The allusion is to the title of Lord Herbert of Lea, which Mr. Sidney Herbert assumed on his elevation to the House of Lords. Lea is the name of a small village near Malmesbury in North Wiltshire, where the Earl of Pembroke still has a property.

matters everything is most prosperous. The people are not in any way irritated by the income tax ; and if it had not been for great mismanagement in Bombay, my ambition to carry it through without showing an armed man anywhere would have been accomplished. The temper and success with which the Native landowners and chiefs have discharged their new duties is more perfect than I ever dared to hope. Sir G. Clerk tells me, writing from 800 or 900 miles away from the side of India where the experiment has been tried, that the announcement of the policy and of the general recognition of adoptions has brought his chiefs and their people generally into such real goodwill towards the Government, that he finds his civil officers offering to dispense with a great part of the troops which are still left to them ; and he says that he believes that in many places we could do literally without any. He is rather impulsive, and I don't mean to try the experiment ; but it is pleasant hearing.

'The really pleasant thing, however, was the other day, when I paid a flying visit to Lucknow, to see the change in the aspect and bearing of the talookdars. I had sixteen or seventeen of those who were nearest, and who had been most active as magistrates, summoned from their districts for about eighty or a hundred miles round, and they came into the room with an erect, manly walk, and looking one straight in the face, cheery and self-possessed, and as respectful as if they had been courtiers all their lives, Eighteen months ago they skulked about the camp with their faces to the ground and a hangdog look that foreboded no good ; but the feeling—and now the certain proof and knowledge—that they are trusted, and that it is intended (though all our officers do not give full effect to the intention) that their authority shall be treated with respect by English as well as natives of all classes, has made men of them. The acuteness and impartiality with which they do their work is quite remarkable. As was to be expected, they have greater pride in it than paid Native judges ; and neither in Oude nor the Punjab has there been the slightest trace of abuse of power, undue favour, or any like malpractice. It is a curious thing that in almost every case in which there has been any doubt as to whether the sentence awarded by them was right, the error, if there was any, was always on the side of leniency.

'I heard three or four days ago that a deputation of Oude talookdars are coming up to Calcutta to bring an address to me, but I do not know to what effect. I believe they are keeping it to themselves. It is as un-Indian a custom (out of the Europeanised towns) as could be imagined. Three months ago or so, a Punjab chief wrote to Bowring to ask if the chiefs of that country might write to the Queen

to request her to appoint me for another five years, but that was knocked on the head at once. All this, with every allowance for interested motives and Oriental suppleness, shows a wholesome temper, and that in the parts of the country which are most critical.

'I have a commission for you about a monument over the well at Cawnpore into which the massacred women and children were thrown. It will not be very troublesome after you have once read the papers which I shall send you, but it will require the discreetest taste and judgment in deciding whom to employ. The plans &c. are not ready yet. 'Ever your affectionate C.'

LORD GRANVILLE TO LORD CANNING.

LONDON, *April* 9, 1861.

'MY DEAR CANNING,—I am delighted to get your satisfactory letter of the 3rd of last month. I doubt your being worthy of Spain, or you would have jumped at my handsome offer of meeting you there; and as to your opinion of the Exhibition of 1862, I consider you a poor shortsighted party, incapable of comprehending all that is grand in the prospect. By a singular coincidence, however, 9,999 persons out of every 10,000 are of your opinion. Nobody wished for it excepting Cole, and it is a great proof of the power of a strong will. But I wish to put on record my opinion that, barring want of cotton, want of food and want of peace for ourselves, the whole thing will be a success.

'Pray do the best you can for us.

'I can conceive nothing more satisfactory than the feeling which you have inspired among the natives of India. How much good service you have crowded into these short five years! I shall be glad, however, to see you back. Where do you intend to look out for a house? I trust in a civilised part of the town. The poor Duke of Sutherland's death has been a great break-up for many of the family. Both Lady Stafford and Stafford have behaved with the greatest affection and consideration for the Duchess. They implored her to keep Trentham, offering her anything she required for its maintenance. It is absurd not being able to live on 10,000*l.* a year, but I am afraid she will find it difficult.

'Palmerston has the gout at Broadlands. It was made worse by his riding. He could not come to-day for the Cabinet, which was to hear Gladstone's Budget, a question on which the Tories expect to do us a great mischief, and which will probably be the turning point of our existence as a Government this year. There is a report, which everyone believed, that Newcastle is your successor. I believe there is no foundation for it, but Newcastle will be angry if the offer is not

made. Lady Waldegrave, who is his principal confidant, says he does not wish it; that he means to be Prime Minister. Elgin arrives to-day, much satisfied—as he has a right to be—with his mission and its results.[1] He will probably be sent to India. I believe Lord John will propose a pension for him. You will have been sorry for poor Dalhousie's death.[2] I spent my holidays at Aldenham, at Keele (becoming a beautiful house, and nearly ready to receive you),[3] and at Althorpe, where the host and hostess are the pleasantest addition to society since you left us. . . . My best and kindest love to Lady Canning. 'Yours affectionately, G.'

LORD CANNING TO LORD GRANVILLE.

CALCUTTA, *June* 17, 1861.

'MY DEAR G.,—I am rather alarmed by a letter from Lady Waterford in which, writing after she had seen you, she suggests as a design for the Cawnpore monument "a woman clinging to a cross with the bodies of murdered children near her." This is the sort of design I wished to avoid. It would be a very painful record to some English families, and a very exasperating one to our fellow-countrymen—soldiers for instance. Nor do I think it desirable to put before the natives for all time to come so literal a picture of the horrors of 1857.

'It was very much with the view of steering clear of anything of the sort that I asked for something ethereal—ghostly; something in which the figures should not represent flesh and blood, but angels or guardian spirits.

'I am afraid that I said something about a Rachel weeping for her children which may have misled you on this point; but even that subject (if it were to be chosen) should be treated quietly and allegorically. The crisis of murder and terror is not the moment to be perpetuated, nor is the first great agony of grief; but rather the after-condition of sober mournfulness sustained and cheered by hopefulness.

'I think that some such sentiment as this is the one which should prevail, not only for Indian reasons, but because the chief purpose of the monument is to mark the grave of Christian people. To convey the story of the massacre is quite a secondary object—if, indeed, it be an object at all.

'I hope that this will be in time. 'Ever yours, C.'

[1] Lord Elgin's mission to China is referred to.

[2] The Marquis of Dalhousie died December 19, 1860.

[3] Keele Hall, the country house of Mr. Ralph Sneyd.

LORD GRANVILLE TO LORD CANNING.

LONDON, *July* 10, 1861.

'MY DEAR CANNING,—You will have been angry and surprised at not hearing earlier from me about your statue, which has given me more pleasing anxiety than any business which I have in hand. At first I wished to defer writing to you till I could say something definite. I should have done better to write from time to time what was passing. The persons whom I have chiefly consulted have been Lady Waterford, Lady Shelburne, and Taunton. No time has been lost. I wrote in the first instance to Marochetti, telling him your wishes in detail, and I said that if this had been for myself, or in a private matter, I should have merely asked him whether he could undertake the commission. As it was, I begged him to send me a sketch, I paying him for it if rejected, and informing him that I should make a similar application to a limited number of sculptors, and decide chiefly according to the advice given me by the Lansdowne family, Lady Waterford, and Taunton.

'Marochetti implored me not to have recourse to competition, that it had always failed here and in other countries; that he did not mind competing if all parties were obliged to exhibit models of the full size; that he did not choose his person to be judged by his waistcoat, that a clever sketch went some way to a picture, that it was of little use as regards a piece of sculpture; that a Venus was preferable to a peasant, but that a well-executed peasant was a better thing than a badly executed Venus.

'We had several conversations, and several letters passed. He at last consented to send a sketch. He advised me to apply to Foley; he thought him clever in composition, and excellent in execution. All the rest he pronounced to be *pitoyable*. After this I decided upon asking him to send me a sketch. He sent me five. I found that there was no reliance to be placed upon Gibson. He won't give up a statue which he likes. Westmacott has given up work. I applied to Foley, who answered that he was much flattered, but that he could not depart from his usual practice, viz. to receive commissions and then execute them. I asked Woolner, a young artist of great imagination and good workmanship, to send a sketch. He has lately made a magnificent statue of Lord Bacon (not altogether a pathetic subject). In the meantime Marochetti had taken a journey, and only came back three days ago. Woolner instead of a sketch has made a very pretty model; a woman leaning against a cross, a dead infant at her feet, a sword worked into the cross (an old English one, not very intelligible to a superficial observer).

'The sketch which we prefer is a new sort of Britannia: not a lady in a helmet ruling the waves, but a handsome pathetic woman with a wreath of cypress on her head, clasping a large plain cross. Marochetti preferred a "St. George in Armour." Lady Waterford thought it beautiful, Lady Shelburne hideous; I thought it too like a *fiancé* to Princesse Marie's Jeanne d'Arc.[1] We all agreed it was not appropriate. Marochetti likes the sketch of the screen. He thinks the architect must be a clever man. It is not in one point favourable for a statue, which the spectator will see at first from nearly a level, before he descends again into the arena surrounding the well. Both he and Woolner thought a canopy over the statue would be desirable. He assumes your measurements to be exactly accurate. If there is any doubt about it he should know. His model will require three months, his statue one year more. I will endeavour to send you a sketch of the Britannia by an early post. 'Yours sincerely,

'GRANVILLE.'

LORD CANNING TO LORD GRANVILLE.

CALCUTTA, *July* 21, 1861.

'MY DEAR GRANVILLE,—Many thanks for the cover into which you have put the Bishop's old letter. He little knew how wild a flight of imagination it was to think that you would write.

'Seriously, I am uneasy at not hearing from you about the monument. I console myself with hoping that the design with the murdered children in the foreground is abandoned; especially as Lady Shelburne speaks of a Britannia which she rather likes. I don't quite figure to myself Britannia as a monument over a grave (one's first thought is of the back of a halfpenny), but I shall be quite content if you have steered clear of the horrible.

'I am getting on pretty well, but it is a great hardship to have one's last months, during which I had looked to finishing off many important matters, broken in upon and frittered away by the work which the absence of two sick Members of Council throws upon me, and this just as I had got together a full and good working Council for the first time since 1857; but there's no help for it.

'Wood says that my successor is not settled, but that in fact there is little choice, and that I shall probably not be far wrong if I guess who it will be. This is oracular, but I suppose it means Elgin. 'Your affectionate C.'

In August, Lord Granville accompanied the Queen as

[1] Princesse Marie d'Orléans, the talented daughter of Louis Philippe, whose work here referred to was generally regarded as her *chef-d'œuvre* in sculpture.

Minister in attendance during a visit to Ireland. Before her departure she had to give her consent to a rearrangement of some of the principal offices in the Administration. As had been indicated by Lord Granville to Lord Canning, the health of Mr. Sidney Herbert had become seriously impaired. He had accepted a peerage in order to lighten the burden of his official duties, but his malady was mortal, and the end, it began to be whispered, could not be far off.

'Poor Herbert is very ill [Lord Granville warned Lord Canning in July]. It is not at all certain that you will find him when you return. I can conceive no greater loss socially and politically. . . . He has placed his resignation in the hands of Palmerston. Lewis is to be War; G. Grey, Home; Cardwell, Duchy of Lancaster; Chichester Fortescue, Irish Secretary, without Cabinet; Hartington, probably Under Secretary of Colonies.'[1]

These changes were important, but the advent at this juncture of Lord Russell in the House of Lords—for under this title we have in future to speak of Lord John Russell—was a more important event than all the other changes. It was so especially to Lord Granville, who on a previous occasion, when such a possibility was under consideration, thought the appearance of the ex-Liberal Premier would be incompatible with his being the leader of the House, a position which Lord Russell might have claimed. Lord Russell, however, declined to press his claims.

LORD GRANVILLE TO LORD CANNING.

16 BRUTON STREET, LONDON, W., *July* 17, 1861.

'MY DEAR CANNING,—Johnny Russell will come up to the Lords immediately. He is to be, I believe, Earl of Ludlow, and some think he has hopes of the present Duke making him a present of at least a portion of the legacy of Lord Ludlow to the late Duke. Rothschild says that the change is unlucky, as the present Lord Mayor, Cubitt, a Tory, will, with the influence of his position, come in. I saw Palmerston on the subject of my continuing to lead, with such a swell as Johnny in the House of Lords. He told me that he had stated to Johnny that he presumed he did not mean to interfere with my position in the Lords, and that Johnny had

[1] Lord Granville to Lord Canning, July 17, 1861.

entirely assented. Pam considered that it was desirable for the Government that no change should be made, and advised me personally to continue.

'He is in a peck of troubles about his other arrangements: the new War Minister must be in the Commons; Charles Wood refuses to give up India; G. Grey is forbidden by his doctor to take such a laborious post. G. Lewis does not much object, but his family and the public think he is a square man in a round hole for it. Pam argued the matter with Lady Theresa.[1] He said his business would be chiefly civil. "He would have to look after the accounts." "He never can make up his own." "He will look after the commissariat." "He cannot order his own dinner." "He will control the Clothing Department." "If my daughters did not give the orders to his tailor, he would be without a coat." Newcastle has been spoken to about India, but without an offer. Elgin will be the man.

'How very uninteresting all this must be to you, excepting the last. I do not know that Elgin is a very good appointment, but, as somebody said, he is like the card which the conjurer forces you to take. He is inevitable. I believe it will not be disagreeable to you.

'How flourishing you are in every way! Sam Laing will be a loss, I presume.[2] 'Yours, G.'

LORD JOHN RUSSELL TO LORD GRANVILLE.

PEMBROKE LODGE, *July* 21, 1861.

'MY DEAR GRANVILLE,—I meant to have said to you yesterday in the Cabinet what I now write to you. It is my earnest desire that you will continue to lead the party in the House of Lords. You are so justly popular, that I should be very sorry to disturb your position and probably weaken that of the Government. I shall be ready to support you in debate, and to take my part on Foreign Affairs as in duty bound. 'I remain yours faithfully,

'J. RUSSELL.'

The hands of Lord Russell were indeed full enough without the additional responsibilities which the lead in the House of Lords would have entailed. Civil war had broken

[1] Lady Theresa Lewis, sister of Lord Clarendon.

[2] Mr. Samuel Laing, M.P., was Financial Secretary to the Treasury, and went out to India as Minister of Finance on the death of Mr. Wilson. He subsequently returned to parliamentary life, and sat as member for Wick and the Orkney and Shetland Isles for many years in the House of Commons.

out in the United States of America; and Italian affairs had hardly passed out of their acutest stage before the friendly relations of Great Britain and the Northern States were endangered by the seizure of the Envoys of the Southern Confederacy, Messrs. Mason and Slidell, on November 8, 1861, on board the steamer Trent. Reparation for this seizure, as well as the release of the captives themselves, was demanded by public opinion. At the end of November the prospect of war was daily becoming more serious. If Mr. Seward in the United States—though at the time this was not known—represented the pacific influences of the hour, the more powerful personality of the President was either in a refractory humour or underrated the risk of a breach with England, should he decline to make reparation for the seizure of the two envoys.[1] Lord Palmerston wrote to Lord Granville that 'the Yankees were in a fool's Paradise;' that President Lincoln had 'told a Canadian that the Federal Government would have no difficulty' in 'getting along' with the Trent affair; therefore, Lord Palmerston went on to say, the news from England would be a 'thunderclap' to the President. He urged on the Cabinet the immediate issue of a Proclamation by the Queen in Council forbidding the export of arms, gunpowder, and saltpetre, as it was plain that war with the United States was possible.

'If that is so [he wrote to Lord Granville], would it not be an act of folly amounting to absolute imbecility, to let those who may soon be our enemies, and whom we believe intending to be, to go on extracting from our own warehouses and workshops the means of war against us? . . . . The right thing would be to prohibit the export of arms altogether; some of our merchants and manufacturers might suffer and complain, but the interest of the few must yield to the welfare of the many.'[2]

While events bore so threatening an aspect on the other

[1] A discussion of the views and position of the eminent men mentioned in the text took place in the *Spectator* during August 1900. I may especially refer to an interesting letter by the late Mr. W. J. Stillman, in which he pointed out as a material fact that Mr. Seward was not President Lincoln's preference, but his defeated rival in the same party, and accepted *malgré lui* through the necessity of party usage, as Secretary of State.

[2] Lord Palmerston to Lord Granville, November 29, December 26, 1861.

side of the Atlantic, the prospect nearer home was not reassuring. Lord Clarendon, who had accepted a special mission to attend the coronation of the King of Prussia, wrote on his way to Königsberg that if the quarrel with the United States ended in war, 'he was sure that Louis Napoleon would instantly leave us in the lurch, and do something in Europe which we could not stand.'[1] Since the annexation of Savoy and Nice, British statesmanship had lost all reliance on the good intentions of the French Emperor being able to withstand the temptation of making a *coup* if an opportunity offered itself, and Lord Clarendon had to confess that he shared that opinion himself.

On the exact terms of the despatch to be sent by Lord Russell to the United States demanding reparation for the seizure of the envoys, much depended. Lord Granville threw all his weight on the side of the section of the Cabinet which, supported by the authority of the Prince Consort, desired to make easy an honourable retreat from the indefensible position which the Government of the United States had been made to assume by the act of a subordinate. In accordance with these views, the original draft of Lord Russell's despatch, on the reception of which the issues of peace or war probably turned, was modified. As ultimately settled, it stated that the British Government was willing to believe that the United States officer who committed the aggression 'was not acting in compliance with any authority from his Government, or that, if he considered himself so authorised, he greatly misunderstood the instructions he had received.'[2] The Government of the United States replied in a suitable spirit, and war was avoided. A few days after this letter was written, the nation was lamenting the death of the Prince Consort; but, though it mourned, the nation did not yet know the full extent of the obligation which it owed to the deceased Prince in regard to these quite recent events.[3]

[1] Lord Clarendon to Lord Granville, September 14, 1861.
[2] Walpole's *Life of Lord John Russell*, ii. 346.
[3] See Martin's *Life of the Prince Consort*, v. 420.

The letters in which Lord Granville conveyed to Lord Canning the first news of the illness of the Prince, had also to carry the tidings of the death of Lord Herbert of Lea. Death at this moment was indeed ravaging the old Ministerial circle. Lord Aberdeen had died almost immediately after the death of the Prince Consort. Lord Lansdowne passed away at the age of eighty-two; 'the youngest man in these days of decrepitude,' so Lord John Russell had described him in a letter to Lord Granville at the close of 1859. When he died early in 1862, his end was not caused by illness, but by the effects of a blow on the head from a fall over a step on the terrace at Bowood. But Lord Aberdeen and Lord Lansdowne at least passed away having accomplished more than the span usually allotted to man—Lord Herbert died prematurely in the prime of life and at the zenith of his powers. Soon afterwards the world of politics and literature was lamenting Lord Macaulay. There was already a sense of 'extraordinary desolation,' to use the words of Mr. Gladstone at this time,[1] when another calamity, felt even more acutely than the losses already enumerated in the inner circle of friendships, came to darken the day. At an interval of little more than a year after the death of Lady Granville, Lady Canning died in India.

LORD GRANVILLE TO LORD CANNING.

BRETBY PARK, *December* 6, 1861.

'MY DEAR BELOVED FRIEND,—I have just received by telegraph this sad, heart-breaking news. I cannot say how I feel for her, and for you; and when I think of you alone, without one intimate friend, whose sympathy might at all events be soothing to you, it makes me miserable.

'Palmerston has asked me to break it to her family. If Lady Stewart and Lady Waterford are in the North, I shall be there in the morning.

'I can hardly believe what I have to tell them of one of the noblest, bravest, best women that ever lived. But it is a moment in which I feel the depth of my affection for you. There is much to console you, but I do not feel equal to urging any such topic upon you.

[1] *Life of Gladstone*, ii. 194.

'God bless you, and give you strength, my dearest Canning, and believe me, 'Yours affectionately,

'GRANVILLE.'

December 9, 1861.

'MY DEAREST FRIEND,—When I arrived in town I found the painful duty had already been performed. I hear pretty good accounts of your poor mother and sister-in-law. The former is tolerably calm and quite submissive, the latter is devoted to her. I have seen some beautiful and touching letters from her.

'You cannot imagine the gloom which has been cast over your friends, and the deep sympathy felt for you.

'It is a blessing for you that you have business which cannot be neglected, and I suppose it is difficult for you to hasten your departure. I cannot say how I long to hear from you, or at all events about you. I trust that you will take care of your health.

'Your being able to attend to business in England may have the most important consequences on the future welfare of India.

'God bless you, my dear Canning. You will always believe me 'Your most affectionate friend,

'GRANVILLE.'

'There is some anxiety about Prince Albert, who has gastric fever.' These words formed a postscript to the above letter, and on the night of the 14th the Prince Consort was no more. It was believed that he had caught a severe chill while attending a review of the Eton College Volunteers on the slopes of Windsor Castle. Fever set in, and the fatal end quickly followed. On the 16th Lord Granville was again writing to Lord Canning with ill tidings.

LORD GRANVILLE TO LORD CANNING.

LONDON, *December* 16, 1861.

MY DEAR CANNING,—In the midst of your great affliction, you will be deeply shocked to hear the fatal news of the night before last. The most valuable life in this country has been taken, and the public are awakening to the value of the good and wise man who is gone.

'The loss to the country is great: to the Queen it is irreparable. I was at Windsor yesterday afternoon, and saw the Prince of Wales, the Duchess of Sutherland and Phipps. I was relieved by their account of the Queen. She gave way much, cried, and was able to speak of him. I am told that her language was simple, eloquent,

and wonderfully touching. She is perfectly docile, anxious to do her duty, and absorbed in the desire to do all that he would have wished. She goes to Osborne to-morrow, on the advice of the doctors, and at the request of Lord Palmerston.

'The Prince of Wales has behaved with great affection and feeling. The Princess Alice has shown singular tact and good feeling. I own I was afraid that the Queen's nervous system would have given way. Perhaps the grief at the Duchess of Kent's death has been a preparation for her. Still her future is fearful. Having given up twenty years, every year more, the habit of ever deciding anything, either great or small, on her own judgment, the strain is immense for her to conduct the affairs of her family, her Court, and of the country. And who has she upon whom she can lean? Excepting once, I cannot remember ever feeling the same dejection as this accumulation of fatal news has now produced.

'Palmerston is ill with the gout in his hand and foot. The death of the Prince has affected him much. I never saw him so low, but there is enough to make him so, coupled with the depression always caused by the gout. Lady Palmerston appeared to me for the first time to be a little anxious about him.'

December 19, 1861.

'My dear Canning,—Palmerston has been worse, and a report was even spread of his death, but the gout coming out more has done him good. Ferguson told him that if he did not take more care of himself, he would wake some morning with a paralysed arm and leg.

'I was sent for on Tuesday by the Princess Alice to see the Queen. I found that the account which had been given to me of her was perfectly correct. She cried and gave way six or seven times, but during the intervals was perfectly calm, discussing the past and the future, and shrinking from no details about the Prince's character, his habits, his constitution, and the events of his last illness.

'Palmerston has declined being put in nomination for the Chancellorship of Cambridge. This will probably be a contest between the Dukes of Devonshire and Buccleuch.

'No decision can arrive from America till after Christmas.

'Ever yours most sincerely and affectionately,

'Granville.'

London, *January* 3, 1862.

'My dear Canning,—I trust that you have been able to resume work, and finish the many important questions you have been so successfully dealing with.

'There has been much here to occupy the public mind. Every day, in great and small things, the great loss of the Prince is brought home to us. The Queen continues well in health, although much thinner. I received a most heartrending letter from her three or four days ago, but it is good that she is able to give vent to her feelings. I am afraid that one of her difficulties will be about the Prince of Wales's travels. . . . Both he and she wish that he should travel in the East. Palmerston has rather objected, but of course will give way. The latter has recovered his health, although the gout leaves him lame.

'The news from America, although not decisive, looks favourable to peace. It will be a great mercy to be spared the war.

'Good-bye, my dearest friend. 'Yours sincerely,

'GRANVILLE.'

TOTTENHAM, *January* 16, 1862.

'MY DEAR CANNING,—I was at Osborne the other day, and saw the Queen, the King of the Belgians, the Prince of Wales, and the Princess Alice. I came away with stronger feelings of devotion and attachment to the poor Queen than ever, but fully as uneasy about the future.

'I am afraid there is little chance of the thing happening which the King of the Belgians says justly is the most important, viz. that she should be very cordial with her Ministers. She retains some of her husband's feelings about Pam and John, and this is increased as regards the former by recollection of great enmity between them at one time, although I believe both the men have entirely forgotten and forgiven it. . . .

'Palmerston has given strong advice against the Prince being sent to Syria, and I am sure it will be much disapproved by the public; but the Queen and the Prince both wish it so much . . . that it is perhaps better that he should go.

'Marochetti has been very dilatory about your commission, but most amiable at the same time. He is now going to have ready before your return, a figure suggested by Lady Waterford, as the embodiment of what she has reason to believe was the intention of her sister, which she has gathered from several letters.

'Yours affectionately,

'GRANVILLE.'

'I hear that you start immediately after Elgin's arrival. How much I long to see you.' Such were the last words of the last letter in the long correspondence which Lord

Granville had carried on with Lord Canning since 1855,[1] letters which Lady Canning described as 'a real delight.' 'You cannot imagine,' she told Lord Granville, 'the treat it has been to have your charming and detailed accounts of everything going on. I have the benefit of enough bits to speak feelingly on the subject.'[2] Lord Canning's appearance in England was anxiously expected. His friends looked forward to welcoming not merely a trusted personal connection, but also a valuable political ally. The health of the Duke of Newcastle was known to be failing and his early retirement probable. Thus there was a prospective vacancy in the Cabinet, and Lord Canning's accession to one of the highest places in the Government might be considered a mere question of time, depending a good deal on his own personal wishes.

'I can hardly believe [Lord Granville had written to him the year before] in the fact of your coming back next year. It is too great a pleasure. . . . I cannot say how I look forward to it, and the long rides we *must* take by the towing path to Cliveden, &c. But the changes have been, alas! more numerous than even you contemplated. As for Herbert, you will have felt what has been universally felt here, that it was the greatest loss, considering his time of life, that could have occurred for the public, for society, and for his friends. His poor sisters are sadly broken-hearted about him. His was after all a singularly useful, brilliant, and happy life, and his end was calm, and without apparently a regret.[3] The Ministry is weakened by his death, and by John Russell's removal to the Upper Form. People think it will not be in existence by the time you are back. I believe no one can tell. It depends upon the health of Pam, who has a great hold on the country, both from his merits and his faults. I saw him the other night looking very well, but old, and wearing a green shade, which he afterwards concealed. He looked like a retired old *croupier* from Baden. My plans are not fixed.'

Among those holding a leading political position in the younger generation of statesmen in 1862, not one was more clearly marked out than Lord Canning for one of the highest

[1] January 16, 1862. [2] May 3, 1861.
[3] Lord Herbert of Lea died August 2, 1861.

posts of all, and there were those who already indicated him as the most fit successor of Lord Palmerston. He was returning home with all the halo of success after a Governor-Generalship unusually prolonged and of exceptional difficulty. His last year in India, as his letters have shown, was one of anxious expectation and constant longing to be again at home, feelings strengthened by the domestic calamity which had befallen him and made every association in India painful. It was tinged also with unavoidable anxiety as to the possible consequences of a stay prolonged beyond the usual limits of duty, which, as Lord Granville had urged, had proved fatal to more than one of his predecessors. What political exile, even if his absence be voluntary, and however splendid may be his surroundings, has not felt his heart thrill and his pulse beat faster at the thought of again hearing the well-known voices of the friends of old? His is the prayer of Ulysses in the magic isle, to see once more before the end

'Gaunt Ithaca stand up out of the surge,'

and he prefers the anticipation to the cloudless skies above and the trappings of Imperial power around the throne.

The long-desired journey was now over; the toilsome days ended; and Lord Canning arrived in England in April 1862 with health apparently unimpaired and strength undiminished. The remark of an intimate friend under similar circumstances to the first Earl of Minto might have been repeated to him, that 'he had a good deal of youth and beauty' still left.[1] But the climate and the prolonged anxieties of a great position had insensibly undermined a constitution originally strong, and only a few weeks after his return Lord Canning—recalling in this too the fate of Lord Minto—was numbered with the dead. Of Lord Minto, Burke had said, 'He was one of the best men I have ever known, and one of the ablest.'[2] On Lord Canning, Lord Granville wrote a fuller epitaph, but it was to the same effect.

[1] *Lord Minto in India*, by the Countess of Minto, pp. 6, 385; *Letters of Burke*, iii. 405.

[2] *Life and Letters of Sir Gilbert Elliot* by the Countess of Minto, ii. 405.

Lord Canning.

A sketch by Lord Granville.

'Canning was like Hoppner's picture of his father as a young man: a great gentleman in character and demeanour. He was handsome, with singularly fine eyes. He was fond of sports, hunting, shooting, and especially fishing, although his pleasure in the latter amusement consisted exclusively in the throwing the fly. His interest was gone as soon as he had hooked his fish. He paid much attention to whatever he did, and generally succeeded in it. He had extraordinary powers of continuous work for months and years, when the occasion arose, together with a facility for being perfectly idle for long periods, hardly looking at a newspaper. Perfectly right about money, neither extravagant nor stingy; so many people are both. He was always prudent, and at the same time liberal. He was of temperate habits.

'He took first-class honours in Classics; second, I think, in Mathematics. He inherited from his father a strong sense of the ridiculous; but his fun, bubbling over at the moment, was never ill-natured. We once went to hear an old Oxford friend, who had become a popular preacher, chiefly owing to an excellent voice and good delivery. He concluded his sermon by telling the congregation the effect it ought to have upon them. "It is no use saying We have heard a good sermon." "Oh, Heaven forbid!" was Canning's rejoinder in a stage whisper.

'I am convinced that, with practice, he would have been a great speaker. But of practice he had less than any public man I have known. It was only in the House of Lords that he spoke, and that seldom. On the occasion of the second reading of a Bill, he broke down. After the breakdown in the House of Lords he spoke on the same Bill when in Committee, and he showed his tact by making it clear that he was not using any of the speech which he had prepared for, but had not delivered, on the second reading. We were not sure whether the cause of the failure was moral or physical. It had happened to him more than once to faint. He did so when shooting with Prince Albert in Windsor Park on seeing that he had fired straight in the direction of the Prince of Wales, then a boy.

'One great characteristic of Canning was his truthfulness; and inaccuracy of any kind was what he was most severe upon in others.

'His departure for India deprived me of the most valuable assistance I ever had in speaking. He always gave me his opinion on my speeches. I knew his criticisms to be exactly what he thought, and

I had absolute confidence in his judgment. There was no question, from the most important points of public and private life to the shape of a saddle, on which I did not miss his advice.

'He was one of my greatest friends. I am not sure that he was the most intimate. He had some natural reserve, and, on the other hand, I should not willingly have told him of things that I had said or done, of which I was ashamed.

'Lord Aberdeen made him his Under Secretary of the Foreign Office. He had implicit confidence in him, and allowed him to do much of the Secretary of State's work. He was greatly looked up to in the Office.

'On the formation of Lord Aberdeen's Government, he was deeply and not unnaturally hurt at not having any Cabinet office offered to him. But he never showed resentment. He was an excellent Postmaster General under Lord Palmerston. I was the first person who told him of the probability of the Viceroyalty of India being offered to him. He at once discussed it and seemed inclined to accept it. It was an interesting conversation. We had travelled by rail to Windsor, attended service at St. George's, and rode to Cliveden, where we had tea, and then dined at Salt Hill.

'His departure and that of the beautiful and clever Lady Canning created a great void in a very intimate society.

'Lord Palmerston gave me leave to write all Cabinet secrets to him while in India. I say nothing of his Indian policy, with which Sir Henry Cunningham is so well acquainted.[1] He is sure to do justice to his moral courage at the time of the Mutiny. Many men would have been unnerved by the local criticism. Few could have resisted as he did the censure coming from Parliament and from the press, from statesmen, great philanthropists, and even from personal friends in England; his almost only support being his admirable wife, who passed away before he left India.

'I was assured by a great doctor on his return that he was perfectly sound. He died, and nearly all his organs were found to be destroyed by the heavy strain, possibly by that of the last additional year, when a sense of duty made him go through.'

The catalogue of calamity before the year was over was to claim yet another victim in the most inner circle of Lord Granville's affections. The earlier chapters of this volume have already shown the tender solicitude with which Lord Granville's mother had watched over her son's early career;

[1] It appears to have been the intention of Sir Henry Cunningham to write a Life of Lord Canning.

and if the narrative of a considerable portion of her life had not already been a labour of love to others,[1] more might have been said in these pages of her constant identification with her son's personal wishes and political ambitions; of the never-failing devotion with which she noted each event, great or small, in his life; of the pride with which she saw him gradually climbing the ladder of fame. 'Darling of my heart,' she had written in reply to congratulations on a successful speech by her son and the gift of the Garter in 1857, 'I shall keep it all where I do that of which I never talk, and that you can hardly know—my excessive love for you. . . . You can steer through all political shallows and depths. The ribband "Yes." Give me what that ribband binds.'[2] It was her death which, before 1862 was over, Lord Granville had to add to the long catalogue of loss. When stunned by the sudden calamity which befell him in 1860 Lord Granville was for a moment contemplating retirement from public life, the advice of Lord Palmerston, 'that the impulse was perfectly natural, yet that it would be very unwise to give way to it, and indeed unjustifiable,' doubtless acted as a tonic; but the feeling that a knowledge of his retirement would have made his mother close her eyes with a sense of failure, probably counted for more than even the opinion of the Prime Minister in causing him to remain at his post. 'I only see comfort,' Lord Russell now wrote, 'in reflecting on her admirable life.'[3]

[1] *Letters of Harriet, Countess Granville*, 1810–1845, edited by her son the Hon. F. Leveson-Gower.

[2] Dowager Lady Granville to Lord Granville, 1857. (Undated.)

[3] Lord Russell to Lord Granville, November 21, 1862.

APPENDIX

FROM HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR-GENERAL OF INDIA.
TO THE RIGHT HONOURABLE SIR CHARLES WOOD, BART.,
G.C.B. &c. &c. &c.

CALCUTTA, *May* 25, 1860.

'DEAR SIR CHARLES,—It is time that I should write to you of my retirement from the Governor-Generalship.

'On March 1 next I shall have held the Government of India five years.

'I wish not to leave India before that, the recognised time. There are matters in progress which I have much at heart, and which I am desirous to see well advanced, and made secure, as far as possible, against disturbance, intentional or accidental, before I turn my face homewards. The new system in Oude, and that in the Punjab, by which the upper classes of the natives are being brought into a position of trust and usefulness, the placing of adoptions on a clear and permanent footing, the new financial measures, and the outline at least of army reorganisation, are amongst these.

'Before March 1, though probably not much earlier, we may, I trust, reckon upon all of them being completed, or definitely laid down.

'After March 1, then, I shall be glad to return home as soon as it may be convenient to you to relieve me.

'There is, however, one other pending question, the settlement of which, above all, I am anxious to have made in my own time. It is the reconstruction of the Executive Government in its intended new form.

'I never dreamt till the other day that there was any chance of this measure being delayed in Parliament beyond the present session; but the close of your last letter (of April 18) has alarmed me on this score, and the alarm is confirmed by my having heard since my return to Calcutta that Mr. Le Geyt has been told by a correspondent in your Council that there will not be any organic change this year.

'Now I confess that I should not like to see the intended change brought before Parliament, or carried into execution in India, immediately upon my retirement. Rather than that this should happen, I would remain in the country another hot season; and therefore if your Bill is not passed in this session, my desire to leave India in March 1861 will cease.

'I do not say this from personal feelings alone, although those feelings are strong; for I cannot patiently look forward to its standing recorded that this great change, by which a more direct and avowed responsibility will be entrusted to the Governor-General, was brought forward as soon as my back was turned.

'Considering the times through which we have been passing, and that for a great portion of them I was necessarily conducting the chief

business of Government away from my Council, an inference very disagreeable to myself (however little intended by you) would jump into the mind of every observer if this were to happen, and it is an inference which nothing that I—or even yourself, if you were disposed to guard me against it—could say or do would prevent. Explanation in Parliament or in a despatch would soon be forgotten. Nobody would know that the change was in close accordance with my own views and suggestions. But the bare fact of my retirement having been immediately followed by it would stand forth in history for all time.

'I speak, however, on public grounds also. I am sure that no Governor-General, even though he had Indian experience, would launch the new system with anything like the advantage to the public service which would attend this being done by myself. The task of a Governor-General who within his first year of office should have to select the secretaries under the new system—to put them into their proper positions, and to keep them there—to remodel a part of their departments—and to discard pretenders to the posts to be filled, would be a very difficult one. He could not perform it satisfactorily unaided, and yet I hardly know where he could find disinterested and safe advice. The advantage of giving to the new Governor-General the choice of his own instruments is not to be compared with that of making the choice through one who has had experience of the working of the Government under the present system, and who knows the men through whom the new system must be carried on.

'I have spoken of the changes in the Executive Council alone, because I imagine that the changes in the Legislative Council will come into the same Bill with them ; but as regards the last-named changes I care much less about being the introducer of them.'

CHAPTER XV

LORD GRANVILLE AS MINISTER OF EDUCATION

1859–1864

THE failure of Lord Granville to form an Administration in 1859 among other consequences prevented the acceptance of office by Mr. Cobden, who was willing to serve under him or Lord John Russell, but not under Lord Palmerston. Mr. Lowe, if subsequent events are to be any guide, was another of those to whom Lord Granville in 1859 would have offered a seat in the inner circle of Government. Under Lord Palmerston he became Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education, of which Lord Granville as Lord President was once more the head. Mr. Lowe in this capacity, as well as in that of Vice-President of the Board of Health, became the representative of the Council Office in the House of Commons. Like so many of the institutions of the country, a National Sanitary Department has been developed in but a slow and tentative fashion. The Board in 1859 still depended upon an Act annually renewed and always bitterly opposed: by nobody more so than by Mr. Tom Duncombe, the Radical member for Finsbury, who in the name of individual liberty, and with a keen eye also to local popularity among the small 10*l.* householders of his constituency, asserted the indefeasible right of the British citizen to refuse to be clean, or to pay rates and taxes for such an object as the removal of nuisances injurious to public health. Thus the Liberal party was on this question a house divided against itself; and many years were to elapse before the then leader of the Opposition, Mr. Disraeli, was to discover that sanitation was and always had been the original and true watchword of the Conservative party.

To add the Board to the number of permanent institutions was in 1859 deemed by Lord Granville to be within the range of parliamentary possibilities and worth an effort But it was on his brilliant representative in the House of Commons that the brunt of the struggle fell, which by the end of the year had for ever secured the existence of a public department entrusted with the defence of the national health, and Lord Granville was the last person to desire to arrogate to himself the honours which properly belonged to another on the field of political battle. But with the question of education his connection was no merely nominal tie. Already in 1853 he had made efforts to secure the passing of an Education Bill, but the obstacles at the time proved insurmountable. Those obstacles were numerous and some of them peculiar. A Bill had been prepared and brought into the House of Commons by Lord John Russell on behalf of the Government, of which the principal feature was to enable boroughs with a population of more than 5,000 to give aid from the rates to local elementary schools. This Bill, which was the parent of all the subsequent proposals to municipalise education, had to be abandoned, like the Reform Bill of that year, under the pressure of the events which led to the Crimean War. Some comparatively modest proposal for increasing the aid to education out of the taxes Lord Granville hoped might nevertheless succeed. But in 1853 Mr. Gladstone, who held the strings of the public purse, was unfriendly, believing that private effort was capable of covering the field of education. Some technical and departmental difficulties also at the moment existed and were urged by him with the practised skill of a trained dialectician in order to defeat the proposals to which he objected.

MR. GLADSTONE TO LORD GRANVILLE.

DOWNING STREET, *July* 11, 1853.

'MY DEAR GRANVILLE,—I shall be very happy, if you think fit, to make the appointment for Thursday at noon which you suggest. But this is not what we really want. The refusal to allow the discussion of the schoolmasters' grant is simply on the grounds of regularity,

as respects the public accounts and control of Parliament over expenditure, and has nothing to do with the merits.

'But when we come to this, the main question, I must say I am wholly without the information necessary to be had before we agree to a grant of public money. I do not question the utility of the plan, but public money should not be voted for it until it is *shown* by a careful exposition of the facts that there is not already sufficient inducement to execute it, either by unaided private moneys, or by these aided by loans of public moneys. Now this is the part of the question that wants thorough working up ; and in which you and I, even with Mr. Temple's aid, can make no progress.[1] It must rest with your office and the Poor Law Board to show what the economical working of the plan will be, where the necessity for Government to interpose begins, and how far it reaches.

'The only fact in my possession is that some gentlemen have applied to me for a loan only, with which they hope to do it in Warwickshire.

'It strikes me that it should be considered whether the Kneller Hall difficulty may not be met in some degree by consolidation with the Army training school.[2] 'Ever yours,

'W. E. GLADSTONE.'

Besides the obstacles arising from the attitude of Mr. Gladstone, it became increasingly difficult, as the shadow of the Crimean War lengthened over the land, to interest the public mind in any subject except diplomacy and military preparations. At that time also the attitude both of the leaders of the Church of England and of some of the most trusted guides of Nonconformist opinion was equally opposed to any advance in establishing a national system of education under the control of the State.[3] The Church of England, it must in justice be granted, had largely departed from the views adopted by many divines of the eighteenth century, who, believing that the people of the

[1] The late Archbishop of Canterbury.

[2] Kneller Hall, near Richmond, was an undenominational training college for Poor Law school teachers. Mr. Temple was the first head of it. Owing to the opposition of the Church party it was not successful, and the Government were considering how to deal with it.

[3] See Miss Martineau's observations on the attitude of the Nonconformists to education, *History of the Peace*, vol. iv. ch. vii. p. 213, ed. 1878; J. Morley, *Life of Cobden*, ii. 21, 22, 30, 41, 84, 146.

country, with the exception of a few favoured individuals, had nothing to do with the laws except to obey them, drew the not strictly logical conclusion from these premisses that the laws of the country would be better obeyed by an uneducated than by an educated people. No doubt even in 1853 there were here and there persons, some hid in obscure vicarages and others placed in the highest stations of the Church, who still held such opinions. But the Church, as represented by those who on this matter had authority to speak in her name, was now battling not against education but for the control of education; and the struggle went on along the whole line, from the Universities and their colleges through the endowed schools down to the humblest class rooms in country villages and in the side streets of the great manufacturing and commercial towns. If however the Church of England was entrenching herself on one side, the Nonconformists were doing so on the other. Thus it happened that when the undenominational training college at Kneller Hall, 'wisely formed in the beginning by Lord Lansdowne, Lord John, and the Committee of Council,' was only requiring, to quote Lord Granville's own words, the 'little additional expenditure, which had been originally intended, to justify the large outlay which had already been made,' the Church of England never rested until that plan was abandoned, although a clergyman of the Church of England—in whom Providence concealed a future Archbishop—had been placed at the head of it. Nor was Nonconformist support either strong or unanimous in favour of the plan.

'I believe it will be found difficult in the present state of religious feeling [Lord Granville therefore went on to tell the Prince Consort] to adopt any great national plan. (1) It is possible to extend the grants made by the Privy Council to elementary schools; (2) to bribe Poor Law guardians to establish pauper district schools, thereby affording a proper field of labour for the highly trained teachers of Kneller Hall; (3) to provide for a better distribution of the funds of educational endowments. Beyond this it is difficult to go, and therefore your Royal Highness's suggestions with reference to scientific instruction ought to be a godsend to the Government.' [1]

[1] Lord Granville to the Prince Consort, January 14, 17, 1853.

The suggestions referred to were for the extension of the system of science and art teaching, of which the first timid beginning had been made in 1837, by the appropriation of a parliamentary grant to aid the foundation of the Normal School of Design. But Lord Granville's hopes, moderate as they were, proved excessive, and the legislative achievements of the Aberdeen Government on the field of education had to be limited to a further extension of the Factory Acts of 1833 and 1846. The Bill for this purpose and a Burials Bill, Lord Palmerston, then Home Secretary, described as his 'two stray children,' and Lord Granville took charge of them in the House of Lords.

'The Bill limiting the employment of children in factories so as to prevent them from being employed earlier than six in the morning or later than six in the evening [Lord Palmerston wrote to him] was gladly accepted by the manufacturers in the House of Commons, as an escape from Cobbett's Bill, which proposed to establish those limits for the moving power; and I am convinced that my Bill will do much good by preventing young urchins from being sent to the mill before their mothers go thither in the morning, and from being left to find their way home in the evening by themselves. It will also in some degree tend to prevent the employment of women and young persons later than six in the evening.'[1]

The Bill passed. Shortly afterwards—as related in a previous chapter—Lord Granville left the Council Office to become Chancellor of the Duchy. When he returned to it in 1855 he had to face the same condition of affairs. He, however, obtained the consent of the Cabinet, which no longer included Mr. Gladstone, 'to propose a very liberal Education Bill in the House of Lords'[2] and to increase the Privy Council vote in the House of Commons so as to extend the capitation grants from the rural to the town districts.

'But [he wrote to Lord John Russell, who was not at the time in office] there is much difficulty in passing any Education Bill. It is not quite seemly that the Government should not stir in the matter.

[1] Lord Palmerston to Lord Granville, August 10, 1853.

[2] See above, pp. 128, 145.

But I would not do anything which would prevent your carrying a Bill through the House of Commons, if you think it possible. I presume it would be difficult to push an Education Bill through many stages in your House during the first six weeks. We are always reproached for giving the House of Lords nothing to do at the beginning of the session. I should be inclined to introduce a Bill there at once. I could fix the stages so that it would either pass, or be thrown out, before the time when anything could be done either by the Government or a private member in the Commons. The Bill which I should propose would be of the simplest character. It would much resemble the Public Libraries Bill of last year.[1] It would enable municipal bodies to erect or assist schools, if they thought fit, without any restrictive conditions. I do not see why we should show so much jealousy of the local bodies. There would be a practical restriction which would operate in nine cases out of ten, viz. that they could get no money out of the Privy Council for their schools, unless those schools were under the Privy Council, while minorities would be protected to a certain degree in the same way. Lord Lansdowne, George Grey, and Palmerston think well of the plan. Of course I wish to be guided as much as possible by you in the matter.'[2]

In reply to this letter Lord John Russell expressed a preference for his favourite plan of proceeding by resolution. He thought Lord Granville's plan well devised, yet doubted if the House of Commons would entertain a Bill coming from the Lords. The extension of the Privy Council grants, the better appropriation of endowments, and rating as a last resort, were in his opinion the main features to be kept in view.[3] But the stars in their courses were hostile; and whether by Lord Granville as Lord President or by Lord John Russell as an independent member, it was as difficult in 1855 to press forward an Education Bill as a Reform Bill amid the storm and stress of the war. 'The *Times* aspires to be not the organ but the organiser of Government,' Lord John Russell wrote to Lord Clarendon about this time;[4] and no sooner was it rumoured that the Government wished to move, and that the resolution which Lord John Russell

[1] 18 & 19 Vict. c. 70, 1854–55.
[2] Lord Granville to Lord John Russell, undated, 1855.
[3] Lord John Russell to Lord Granville, December 8, 1855.
[4] Lord John Russell to Lord Clarendon, July 22, 1855.

proposed to make would receive official support, than that powerful newspaper commenced a hostile campaign, not because it loved education less, but because it disliked Lord John Russell more. It was insinuated that the ministers, such as Lord Granville, favourable to his plans represented only themselves; and that a vote against the resolutions would not be distasteful to the Government as a whole. 'Your friend Mr. Delane,' Lord John Russell wrote to Lord Granville, 'seems to be drunk with insolence and vanity. But he will spare you, as long as you make him your intimate friend;' and he described how some gentlemen talking privately against 'limited liability' in the House of Commons had found themselves 'gibbeted' next day.[1] The prospect, as the session advanced, became more and more involved, and the idea of introducing a measure had to be abandoned by the Government. In the following year with characteristic fearlessness Lord John Russell decided, although Lord Granville felt the risk of mooting the matter in the face of a hostile audience and a formidable Opposition, to go on himself. He was badly defeated, as the Peelites joined their former friends to oppose him.

'So education is gagged for this year [he wrote to Lord Granville with a sigh]. I suppose you will hardly proceed with your Bill, which Graham and Gladstone will certainly oppose. However, you may live to see a much greater scheme than mine carried, for I cannot believe this country will in the end consent to be so much behind all others, except Spain and Turkey.'[2]

Although the larger measure was abandoned, it was found possible to pass a Bill for the permanent appointment of a Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education and for the transfer to that department of certain matters relating to education which had hitherto belonged to other departments, such as the superintendence of the Civil Service examinations and the giving of advice on educational matters which devolved on the Charity Commissioners. Beyond this no progress was made. Other and less controversial

[1] Lord John Russell to Lord Granville, October 10, December 7, 1856.
[2] *Ibid.*

fields, however, fortunately existed where the cause of education in other branches could be pushed. It has already been seen that in connection with the work of the Exhibition of 1851, Lord Granville had acted as the right-hand man of the Prince Consort. This co-operation continued in regard to the endeavours of the Prince to raise the standard of science and art teaching in England, and to use the surplus funds of the Exhibition with that object. As in most matters of the kind, private effort had to precede and stimulate public endeavour. But in 1857 the Science and Art Department was at last constituted, finding a home in South Kensington, and a great meeting presided over by the Prince Consort at Willis's Rooms in June gave an impetus to this side of the educational movement which makes it a landmark in the history of the question.

In regard to public elementary education, after another unsatisfactory parliamentary experience in 1856, it was at last deemed advisable by Lord Granville to proceed on the line of least resistance; and the decision was accordingly taken, in the days immediately preceding the fall of Lord Palmerston's first Administration in 1858, to appoint a Royal Commission to inquire and report. The Chairmanship was in the first instance offered by Lord Granville to Lord John Russell.[1] It was ultimately accepted by the Duke of Newcastle. The basis and proper method of distribution of the Privy Council grants for popular education was the special order of reference for the inquiry thus instituted. The sittings of the Commission were necessarily protracted; nor did it report till 1861. The Chairman wrote at an early date warning Lord Granville, now again at the Council Office, that their recommendations would mean great expense, and that in order to avoid public odium it would be necessary before proposing them to Parliament to make large corresponding reductions if possible in other branches of public expenditure.[2] This warning naturally found a responsive listener in the mind of

[1] Lord John Russell to Lord Granville, February 17, 1858.

[2] Duke of Newcastle, January 11, 1860.

Mr. Gladstone, who was again at the Exchequer; but he acknowledged to Lord Granville that other reasons, besides economy, weighed with him. 'With my clerical constituency,' he wrote, 'I have as many motives to keep me back, apart from the merits of the case, as one can well have.'[1] No warning could be franker or more honourable. There was in fact a fundamental difference of opinion which it was idle to conceal. Mr. Gladstone believed in the necessity of teaching religious dogma to the children of the working classes. Lord Granville believed that the minds of children of a tender age were not capable of receiving it.

'Your Grace [he once wrote on this subject to the Archbishop of Canterbury] seems to imply that no useful teaching on ordinary subjects can be given, which is not interspersed by religious teaching of a controversial character. I was educated at a private school, at a public school, and at a university, the teachers in all of which were clergymen of the Church of England. I cannot remember an instance, during the ordinary school lessons, in which incidental religious instruction was given inextricably bound up with the doctrines in dispute between Churchmen and Dissenters.'[2]

The Commission recommended, and the section of the Cabinet represented by Lord Granville and Lord John Russell desired, three things:—to make the Privy Council grants depend on the examination of individual scholars; to introduce a 'conscience clause;' and to encourage the foundation of schools, where the voluntary system was inadequate, supported by rates to be levied by municipal and county educational authorities. In these schools, according to the view of the Whig statesmen, a form of religious education representing the points of Christianity common to all Churches and sects might be taught: a system which they undoubtedly hoped and believed would ultimately prevail by its own merits over every other system in all State-supported schools, as Lord John Russell had told the House of Commons in 1839.[3] But in 1861 Lord Granville was con-

[1] Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville, January 17, 1860.

[2] Lord Granville to the Archbishop of Canterbury, July 21, 1869.

[3] Lord John Russell, *Speeches and Despatches*, ii. 79.

tent to aim less high, and by following the recommendations of the Commission he hoped to obtain unanimity in the Cabinet for a more restricted plan than that actually favoured by Lord John Russell and himself. Some form of 'conscience clause' —the right to withdraw a child from religious education disapproved of by the child's parents—Mr. Gladstone was ready to accept, but with the undenominational teaching of religion he did not sympathise nor did he believe in the possibility or justice of teaching it at the public expense. It is no unfair surmise that if Mr. Gladstone had made the education question his own in 1870, he would have decided either in favour of the complete separation of secular and religious teaching, a solution advocated by no less eminent a Churchman than Dean Hook, or in favour of a completely denominational system. There is no reason indeed to believe that even in his later years Mr. Gladstone ever held any view but one unfavourable to the undenominational teaching of religion. It was 'a pitfall,' he thought, 'into which whoever was precipitated would probably find the substance of the Gospel has escaped or is fast escaping from his grasp.' His opinion, as expressed in his writings, was that 'if the State should think proper to frame new creeds by cutting the old ones in pieces and throwing them into the cauldron to be reboiled, we have no remedy, except such as may lie hidden among the resources of the providence of God. . . . Let Christianity,' he therefore argued, 'keep its own acts to its own agents, and not make them over to hands which would justly be deemed profane and sacrilegious when they come to trespass on the province of the sanctuary.'[1] The 'province of the sanctuary' in Mr. Gladstone's mind certainly included the teaching of religion to children; and even in regard to the conscience clause he raised many ingenious points, as may be seen from the following letter written a few years after these events, when the question was again prominent.

[1] Mr. Gladstone, *Later Gleanings, Theological and Ecclesiastical*, pp. 299, 303, 304.

MR. GLADSTONE TO LORD GRANVILLE.

September 6, 1865.

'MY DEAR GRANVILLE,—I have not yet been able to read the evidence on education; if, therefore, I trouble you with *bêtises* on the conscience clause, which it disposes of, do not take the pains to answer this letter. But I am uneasy about the ticket you have chosen for it (I say *you*, because I do not know that it has even been before the Education Committee), which seems to me difficult to defend by reason of antiquity.

'Provision I understand is required to allow the withdrawal of the children of Dissenters from instruction in the "formularies *and doctrine*" of the Church of England. What does this mean? If it be limited to instruction from *ex professo* in Church doctrine, it is an immediate corollary to the exemption from formularies; but this limitation of meaning is too important I think to be left as matter of inference only. And then arises the question whether it could or ought to satisfy the Dissenting argument.

'But suppose the schoolmaster is reading with his boys the third chapter of St. John, and he explains the passage relating to baptism in the sense of the Prayer Book and Articles. The Dissenter would say this is instruction in the doctrines of the Church of England. Now it is utterly impossible for you to tell the Church schoolmaster or the clergyman that he must not in his school explain any passage of Scripture in a sense to which any of the parents of the children, or at least any sect, objects; for there you would in principle entirely alter the character of the religious teaching for the rest of the scholars, and in fact upset the whole system. The Dissenter, on the other hand, ought (in my opinion) to be entitled to withdraw his child from the risk (if he considers it such) of receiving instruction of the kind I describe. But would the conscience clause secure to him this right? Would not a very awkward wrangle arise upon the question whether *bonâ-fide* exposition of the Scripture text, incidentally touching doctrine in which the Church of England differs from some other body, is to be considered as "instruction in the doctrine of the Church of England"? It would not be desirable to leave the decision of such a question to an excentric and political department with fluctuating views.

'It appears to me as if the right of withdrawal ought to embrace the whole or any part of the religious instruction, or of what the parent considers to be such. You are strong on this ground, but weak, as I think, when you use language which gives even the faintest colour to the imputation that your real meaning is, under

cover of protecting exceptional consciences, to invade the integrity of the instruction which is to be given to the mass of the children.

'Sincerely yours,

'W. E. GLADSTONE.'

Violent opposition manifested itself against the proposal of the Commission to introduce municipal rating for education. The opposition was of a twofold character. It arose partly from the representatives of Nonconformist opinion, who objected to being rated for schools most of which, especially in the country districts, were, and would continue to be, under Church control; and partly from the representatives of the ratepayers themselves. At an early stage therefore this proposal had in consequence to be abandoned. There remained the question of the basis on which the Government grants were to be distributed. It was around this question that the battle was now fought, and here Lord Granville, under the influence of Mr. Lowe, parted company with Lord Russell.

Those who take part in public affairs at the present day have watched a steady process by which the inspection of schools as the basis of the grants paid by the Government has been substituted for the examination of individual pupils; but in 1859 the tendency was towards an exactly opposite change. Inspection of the school as a whole was then the rule, but many—and those the persons most conversant with the subject—considered that inspection was not producing satisfactory results; that too much time was being sacrificed to the production of a few brilliant pupils, and that the rank and file of the elementary scholars of the country frequently left school without even the slender equipment in reading, writing, and arithmetic requisite to fit them for the struggle of life. The abandonment of inspection as the basis of the payment of Government grants thus became in 1861 the cry of the educational reformer. This order of ideas prevailed up to a certain point with the Royal Commission, for one of their principal recommendations was a proposal that the future basis of the Privy Council aid should be a system of capitation grants, to be paid per head on the

average number in attendance, and to be divided into three classes according to the age of the children, the size of the school, and the report of the inspector of the school.[1] When the Revised Code appeared, it was accordingly found that, in addition to many other proposals which excited controversy, it had adopted a plan largely reversing the existing state of things, and proposing to introduce a system of payment depending on the results of the examination of individual pupils, according to the number of passes in reading, writing, and arithmetic, coupled with the future condition of a favourable report being given in regard to the discipline of the school and the efficiency of the religious instruction. This system, of which Mr. Lowe was the author, the managers of the schools declared would greatly reduce their income; would oblige them to reduce the salaries of the teachers; and would tend to degrade the condition of the teaching given.

A bitter contest now in consequence arose, which raged with equal fury both inside and outside Parliament. Enormous deputations, which 'thought to prevail by their numbers and much speaking,' invaded the Council Office; and Lord Granville, as titular head of the Office, had to receive them all, especially when, as a rule, they said they had come to appeal to the Lord President to save them from the talons of the Vice-President. Lord Palmerston is said to have once defined a deputation as 'a noun of multitude, signifying many but not much,' but these deputations were formidable. 'Here they come in number about five thousand,' was Mr. Lowe's pithy description of a body of enraged clergy who were thronging the passages one summer morning and about to seek an audience of the Lord President.[2] Lord Granville stood firmly by the Minister around whose head the clerical lightning played in the House of Commons. He had able and loyal advisers in Mr. Helps and Mr. Lingen, who were in entire harmony

[1] A summary of the Report of the Commission will be found in *Four Periods of Public Education*, by Sir James Kay Shuttleworth (Longmans, London, 1861), p. 563.

[2] Patchett Martin, *Life of Robert Lowe, Viscount Sherbrooke*, ii. 219.

with the policy of their parliamentary leaders; but he failed to secure the support of the equally high authority of Sir James Kay Shuttleworth, who for many years had been the able and indefatigable Vice-President of the Council before that post had been made a parliamentary office. Sir James now expressed himself with some acrimony as to the changes proposed by his successor, which he regarded as the reversal of the principles of the Minute of 1846 on Inspection, of which he was the acknowledged author, and he published a powerful criticism of the Revised Code in the shape of two letters addressed to Lord Granville. He thereby greatly strengthened the opposition, which was now able to cite on their own side the authority of the man generally regarded as the practical founder of the system of national education in England, who had hitherto been the object of their attacks and was chiefly known as the trusted adviser of former Presidents of the Council.[1] But notwithstanding the high authority of Sir James Kay Shuttleworth, the antagonists of the Code could not deny the broad fact which came clearly out of the Report of the Royal Commission, viz. that whereas 2,200,000 children ought to have been in the inspected schools, not more than 920,000 actually attended them, and that only 230,000 received adequate and efficient instruction in the elements of reading, writing, and arithmetic. The Revised Code it was said remedied the objection made to the existing system of Privy Council grants, that three-fourths of the children of the working classes obtained no education, and that the expense was incommensurate with the results.

A minor but not unimportant ground of attack on the Revised Code was that it had been published just after the rising of Parliament in 1861, and that an attempt had been

[1] *Two Letters to Earl Granville, K.G.*, in 1861: (1) on the recommendations of the Commissioners appointed by warrant under the Queen's sign manual of June 30, 1858, to inquire into the present state of popular education in England as contained in their report dated March 18, 1861, presented to both Houses of Parliament by command of her Majesty; (2) on the minute of the Committee of Council on Education, dated July 29, 1861, establishing a Revised Code of regulations for the distribution of the parliamentary grant.

thereby made by Lord Granville to steal a march on the public. It was urged that changes so considerable ought to have been embodied in a Bill; and that so large an exercise of legislative powers by a public department, even though not *ultra vires*, was nevertheless objectionable, and went beyond what Parliament had intended when it confided those powers to the Privy Council.

Lord Granville explained the Code to the House of Lords in a speech of great clearness and studied moderation, in which he pointed out that, whatever else might be true, the cry which had been raised of 'The Church in danger!' was ridiculous, and indeed hardly honest, for the religious inspection was not touched, and the whole grant to a school might be disallowed on an unfavourable report of the religious teaching and moral discipline. Mr. Helps had a long interview with his chief the day before the battle began.

'After I went away [he wrote to him early in the morning of the following day] I thought over what you had said, and liked it all. You will make a great speech. One point, however, you did not mention, though I think it must have been in your mind, and I want you to give three or four sentences to it. It is this—that with the acknowledged facts before you, you were bound to make a change in the system. There could have been no clamour if there had been but little change. You, however, knowing well the difficulty of the subject, foreseeing large opposition and great misconstruction, determined to endeavour to provide a remedy for an acknowledged evil, and not to be content with patching. To have done otherwise would have been an easy course, but would have been a signal dereliction of duty.

'I tell you why I want you to labour this obvious point. People in general seem to think that you and Lowe rushed out, like Irishmen at a fair, to have a blow at something or somebody. Show that you were obliged to come forth as you have done; and ask them whether any great plan that could have been devised to meet the evil would not have been sure to encounter the resistance that belongs to every project of sound reform. Do not fear to make too long a speech to-day. It is a very great matter, and will bear an ample treatment.

'You can at the same time be severe in argument and gracious in expression. The latter is very needful to-day, even towards Shuttleworth. You will remove the discussion into a higher sphere

than personal contention. That sort of work may be done elsewhere.

'Forgive me for thus troubling you; but few people, I believe, watch your career with more affectionate anxiety (if I may say so) than I do.

'Be very tender [he added in a postscript] with the schoolmasters, even though they may have gone beyond their province. Think what a conceited animal by nature a pedagogue is.'[1]

The struggle, however, was only just beginning. All through March and April it raged in both Houses. In the House of Lords, Lord Granville had to face not only the regular leaders of the Opposition, who were quick to seize the opportunity afforded them, but also the formidable attacks of the Bishop of Oxford, and the friendly but not less dangerous criticism of experts such as Lord Lyttelton.[2] Lord Palmerston's experienced eye quickly saw danger ahead. Some concessions it became clear would have to be made in order to save the ship, and the Government eventually consented that the Privy Council grants should be given on a system framed so as to recognise not only 'passes' in examination, but attendance also; that the grouping of pupils for examination in specified subjects should be made in such manner as the managers might determine; and that it should be more clearly expressed that the grant was to be withdrawn if religious instruction should be found to be neglected. Some useful proposals in regard to the training colleges had also to be abandoned; for they had excited the apprehensions of the Church, and any further revision of the Code would, it was promised, be laid before Parliament at least a month before coming into operation. These and some other minor concessions Lord Granville announced in the House of Lords on April 11; stating at the same time that they were made out of deference to the wishes of the House of Commons, and not because the Government approved of them on their

[1] Mr. Helps to Lord Granville, February 12, 1862.

[2] The principal debates in the House of Lords were on February 13 and March 4, 1862.

merits.[1] Thus for the moment did this great struggle end; but the same questions which distracted the educational reformers in the early sixties have come up again and again during the past forty years, and although the leaders of Nonconformity have learnt wisdom, the claims of the Church still continue a permanent obstacle in the path of those who desire to set up a really national system of education in this country.

In 1863 a 'conscience clause' was proposed. Though at the time confined to parishes having only one school, it was bitterly attacked because it exempted the children of Nonconformists from compulsory attendance at the religious teaching and the public worship of the Church of England, and was therefore denounced as an infringement of the most sacred rights of the Establishment. Lord Granville and Mr. Lowe, however, triumphed on this occasion; but for Mr. Lowe it was a Pyrrhic victory, and he had to pay the penalty of success. He was soon after accused of 'editing' the reports of the inspectors of education in an unjustifiable manner, in order to make them appear more in harmony with his own views than they really were in regard to the effects of the Code and kindred matters; and had to succumb to a parliamentary attack from the disappointed and infuriated Church party who on April 12, 1864, succeeded in carrying a motion in the House of Commons censuring what was termed 'the mutilation' by the Vice-President of the school reports. Mr. Lowe considered that he had been but weakly defended by some of his colleagues in the House of Commons,[2] from which the departure of Lord John Russell had removed the only Minister besides himself with a keen personal interest in education, though it is true that Lord John Russell viewed the proposals of the Code in regard to inspection—involving as they did a reversal of the policy of 1846—with no great favour.

[1] The principal debates on these questions will be found in *Hansard*, clxv. 89, 170–184, 345, 1007, 1014–15, 1022, 1136–1146, 1500; clxvi. 537–538, 755–758, 831–834.

[2] Patchett Martin, *Life of Robert Lowe, Viscount Sherbrooke*, ii. 220.

It was otherwise in regard to the conscience clause, and Mr. Disraeli was able to taunt the Cabinet successfully with the weak support which in Lord John Russell's absence from the House they had given to their own policy. Certain it is that Mr. Lowe himself considered that in the House of Commons he had lacked the chivalrous support which he had received in the House of Lords.

Lord Granville and Mr. Lowe both immediately tendered their resignation after the vote of April 12. Lord Palmerston requested them both to withdraw it. Lord Granville stated that he could not do so unless Lord Palmerston could induce the House of Commons also to withdraw the stigma which they had attached to him as head of the Privy Council Office. Lord Palmerston considered that no attack had been made on Lord Granville, and this was true. After some further explanations in the House of Commons, Lord Granville accordingly withdrew his own resignation.[1] But Mr. Lowe, who understood that he undoubtedly had been the object of a personal attack and a personal censure, deemed it impossible to overlook these obvious facts, and therefore adhered to his determination, and demanded the appointment of a committee to examine the charges made against him. Lord Granville considered that Mr. Lowe was the best judge of what was required by his own sense of honour, and when the final decision had been taken he conveyed his own feelings to Mr. Lowe as follows :—

LORD GRANVILLE TO MR. LOWE.

16 BRUTON STREET, *April* 17, 1864.

'MY DEAR LOWE,—I am still of opinion that logically you should have awaited the decision of the Committee; but I appreciate the scrupulous delicacy with which you regard a point affecting your personal honour. You refer in very kind words to our relations during the last five years. Those personal relations are now for a time broken. I shall miss every day the support I have received from your remarkable powers of mind, and the confidence I have reposed in your unswerving zeal for the advantage of the public service. I shall miss still more the opportunity of daily intercourse

[1] *Hansard*, cxci. 1323.

with one for whom feelings of regard have gradually strengthened into those of strong attachment. I am sure you will join with me in preventing such intercourse being sensibly diminished.

'Yours sincerely,

'GRANVILLE.'

Encouraged by their partial success in the field of primary education, the Government determined to try to touch the edge of the question known to a former and comparatively plain-minded generation as Middle Class Education, but then beginning to be termed Secondary Education, and since termed 'Education other than Elementary,' thereby once more making public confession of the inability of the English language to express itself clearly in legal terms.[1] In 1864 legitimate grounds existed for a respite of action, because the facts on which alone action could be based were not as yet ascertained. A motion was made in the House of Commons urging some action by Sir John Pakington and accepted by the Government. The appointment of a Royal Commission which followed to examine and report was no excuse for delay, but a legitimate step. The selection of the Commissioners, however, was no easy task. The first persons Lord Granville consulted were Lord Russell and Mr. Lowe. To the latter he offered a place upon it: to the former he offered the Chairmanship. The names of Lord Lyttelton, Lord Taunton, Mr. W. E. Forster, Lord Fortescue, Dr. Temple, Dean Lake, Dr. Storrar, Sir Stafford Northcote, Mr. Twistleton, and Mr. Halford Vaughan were only a few of those suggested for an invitation to serve. The choice of a chairman was above all things difficult. Lord Russell, owing to the ties of the Foreign Office, declined. Lord Clarendon and Lord Devon were next suggested. Eventually Lord Taunton accepted. Still more difficult was the choice of the Commissioners. From Mr. Lowe, Lord Granville received the following characteristic letter of advice in which he refused the offer of a place:—

[1] See the language of the Education Act, 1902, 2 Edward VII., c. 42, s. 2.

MR. LOWE TO LORD GRANVILLE.

SHERBROOKE, CATERHAM, SURREY, *October* 21, 1864.

'MY DEAR GRANVILLE,—I am very much obliged to you for the trouble you have been so kind as to take. I need not trouble you to-morrow, for the list of the Commission is quite enough to satisfy me that I could be of no use on it. I never like entering a body of the kind without having some hope of managing it, and here I see none.

'The only man in whom I should have any confidence is Temple, and he could hardly attend regularly, and is a parson after all: a very material point when you come to deal with the appropriation of endowments. Forster is not the least to be trusted in Church and education matters, and wants education himself. Carpenter or Storrar would have little influence.

'Altogether, therefore, I think I should be able to do no good, and hope you will not think me captious or unkind if I beg you to excuse me from serving on this inquiry.

'Believe me always, with many apologies for the trouble I have given you, 'Very sincerely yours,

'ROBERT LOWE.'

If Mr. Lowe was severe on Mr. Forster, Lord Lyttelton, whom Lord Granville next consulted, was equally severe on others of their suggested colleagues. In a letter declining the Chairmanship, he asked 'to be excused if he wrote at much greater length than Lord Granville had perhaps bargained for.' His great attainments notwithstanding, he well knew that his handwriting was the despair of his friends, who in after years invented an excellent tale that he had put in an amendment at the table of the House of Lords to the Reform Bill of 1867, proposing that nobody who could not read *and write legibly* should be entitled to vote, but had that amendment returned to him by the Clerk next day as itself illegible and incapable of entry on the Journals without further explanation. 'Frederick Cavendish,' he now wrote, 'says that when you got an unusually long and *illegible* letter, it always came to him noted, "What is all this about?" But the second epithet is so clearly inapplicable *in my case* that I cannot anticipate anything of the kind.' So he went on to review his proposed colleagues, beginning with Lord Clarendon.

Lord Clarendon had identified himself with the reform of the great public schools, a task which he had taken in hand with the support of the Government, and with the special good-will of Lord Granville, who, like Lord Clarendon, desired to see modern languages, history and science, occupying some portion of the time too exclusively devoted, especially at Eton, to the practice of writing Latin verses. A Royal Commission had been appointed, and had just concluded its labours. Of that Commission, Lord Clarendon had been Chairman. Lord Lyttelton had been one of his colleagues, with several others of those whose names were now suggested for the inquiry on Secondary Education. Lord Clarendon however, in the opinion of Lord Lyttelton, sinned by making jokes, which annoyed the witnesses; while Lord Devon sinned by not being able to joke at all. 'He can laugh sometimes,' Lord Lyttelton said, 'but a joke you might as well expect from a bell-wether or a Newfoundland dog.' In regard to the other members of the Commission, Sir Stafford Northcote judging from past experience would, he thought, be 'the ablest and most serviceable of the lot,' but 'he is devoured by political ambition, and if your rickety Government tumbles to pieces, he becomes Chancellor of the Exchequer and exit.' Mr. Edward Twistleton was 'a queer man, who had long fits of silence and torpor alternating with great vivacity.' Professor Hepworth Thompson—afterwards Master of Trinity—was 'a man of most polished and philosophical intellect, of great wit and humour, but overrefined and fastidious, somewhat too satirical and constitutionally very indolent, though if you poke him up he will do a fair share of work.' Nevertheless, for all these there was much to be said, but there was one man to be avoided. That man was Halford Vaughan, the glory and the despair of a bygone Oxford generation. In regard to him, said Lord Lyttelton:—

'He is a marvel of subtle and minute industry, power of elaborate investigation, and long-drawn and luminous statements and arguments, at least as luminous as his labyrinthine processes of thought admitted of; but much of it far too artificial and theoretical; and his

practical results, though not to be despised, by no means in proportion to the quantity of matter out of which they came. He used to rule his own statistical tables, and do all kinds of work down to that of the merest clerk, for himself. But with all this as a colleague he was intolerable. He would puzzle any witness out of his wits with metaphysical cross-questioning; and so disputatious, prolix, unmanageable a man in council, it was hardly possible to meet with. He quarrelled, I believe, with nearly all his friends, and lives a sort of hermit life at the top of Hampstead Heath.' [1]

Such are but a few of the opinions of candid friends, conscious of one another's disabilities, to be found among the mass of replies to the letters which Lord Granville addressed to many eminent persons, either inviting them to serve on the Commission or seeking their advice whom it would be politic to invite: replies which if collected might form a valuable additional chapter of the work entitled *What Great Men have said of Great Men.* Meanwhile it must suffice to note that eventually a commission was issued on December 28, 1864, to Lord Taunton as Chairman with Lord Stanley, Lord Lyttelton, Sir Stafford Northcote, Dr. Hook, Dr. Temple, the Rev. A. W. Thorold, Mr. Acland, Mr. E. Baines, Mr. W. E. Forster, Mr. Erle, and Dr. Storrar, as colleagues. Mr. Halford Vaughan was left in the retirement of his hut on Hampstead Heath.

The interest of Lord Granville in education was not ministerial only, nor confined to his office. In the Potteries, with which he was closely connected, an enormous 'school population,' to use the modern phrase, was growing up. For over a quarter of a century he was the sole lessee of the Shelton collieries, and was one of the largest shareholders in the iron and steel works at Etruria, and when those two great industrial undertakings were amalgamated he became Chairman of the Board of Directors. With Mr. William Woodall as an adviser, he founded elementary schools at Cobridge, and in connection with the Coal and Iron Masters' Prize Scheme supported one of the first of the numerous plans for continuation classes, out of which at a later date

[1] Lord Lyttelton to Lord Granville, 1864, undated.

the movement for technical education developed itself. In the success of the Wedgwood Institute he also took an active interest, accompanying Mr. Gladstone in 1863 on the occasion of the laying of the foundation stone and the delivery by him of one of those addresses which reminded the public how wide the range was of the varied accomplishments of the Chancellor of the Exchequer.

As Chancellor of the London University, to which he was elected in 1856, Lord Granville became intimately associated with the cause of higher education at the centre of the life of the nation. 'It might be said,' Sir James Paget observed when Vice-Chancellor, 'that the work there was to Lord Granville in some ways perhaps like a recreation, inasmuch as it enabled him to escape from the conflicts of politics.' The period of Lord Granville's Chancellorship—it lasted altogether thirty-five years—'was one of continual progress, not only in the University, but in the prosperity and advancement of the highest education throughout the United Kingdom,'[1] and made considerable demands on the time and attention of even the titular head of the University, who however had very strong opinions of his own on some educational subjects.

The cause of admission of women to the examination and degrees was in particular one which he was never weary of pleading, and his wit and good humour had perhaps as much to say to the success in the final struggle as the heavy artillery of more serious arguments. Were not 'blue stockings,' it was frequently asked, the most odious of the human race? Would not the proposed examination be an invitation to blue stockings? Was the University tamely to allow itself to be overrun with 'blue stockings'? Heaven forbid! Lord Granville fortunately had not forgotten how Sydney Smith had poured ridicule on those who believed that 'the perpetual solicitude a mother feels towards her children depends on her ignorance of Greek and mathematics;' and 'that she would desert an infant for a quadratic equation!'

[1] Sir James Paget, speech on Presentation Day of the University of London, May 13, 1891, in the *Times* of May 14, 1891.

'O yes! [he replied to his critics] he was ready to admit that the most detestable women he had met with were those who might be properly called "blue stockings;" but he agreed with Dr. Johnson, who met a similar argument by saying that if you gave a silk-laced waistcoat to a country lad, he would be proud and haughty over his fellows of the village, but that if you gave all the boys in the parish a silk-laced waistcoat, there would be no one over whom they could be proud. This, he thought, applicable to the women. If they were all educated alike, they would have no cause to pique themselves upon their superiority. But in this case he would appeal to the other sex, and ask whether they had never met with men with some small literary talent, but ungainly in manner, in mind presumptuous, dogmatic in conversation, and without any real merits whatever to justify their pretensions; and yet it would hardly be contended that, because such characters were to be met with, the London University should abstain from adopting a system of education which would tend to raise the moral and intellectual character of the people of this country. He would further appeal to the meeting whether they had not known women who of late years had written on science, art, history, political and social subjects, and shown a power in poetry and works of imagination, who were, in many instances, the most agreeable, most amusing, most modest, and simple women they had ever known in their lives. He once was speaking with his late friend, Signor Marochetti, of a lady of great talent whom they both knew, when he remarked, "She is a great man, but she is also a charming woman."'[1]

The realisation of the advantage which his own knowledge of French had been to him, made Lord Granville urge that the conversational knowledge of modern languages should be given weight in the university and Civil Service examinations. On this subject he carried on a long but friendly controversy with Mr. Grote. Even the Post Office he thought might be encouraged to cultivate such knowledge. Had he not himself once received a letter with an address, a natural one for a Frenchman to write, *En son hôtel à Londres*, and had not this proved too much for the officials of St. Martin's le Grand, who when they at length forwarded the letter to the proper destination were found to have first marked the envelope, 'Not known at the *Euston Hotel*'?

[1] Speech at the London University, May 13, 1868, in the *Times* of May 14, 1868.

Lord Granville's power of adapting himself to the mood of the moment, added to the gift of conversational eloquence, had from an early date secured to him a special welcome on all non-political occasions and the reputation of being the most popular after-dinner speaker of his day—in Lord Canning's phrase, 'the great master of public joking'—equally welcome at the Literary Fund Dinner, or at the annual banquet of the Royal Academy, as at the Iron and Steel Institute, where the principal owner of the Shelton Mineral Estate seemed to be in his natural element, and where anybody listening to him would easily have been persuaded that the development of the iron industries of England had been the sole interest and the principal occupation of his life. Speeches on such occasions were also, he thought, good practice; and he once recommended Lord Hartington to attend innumerable charity dinners for the benefit of his elocution. But of all such occasions Lord Granville's opening address at the annual prize day of the University of London was always looked forward to as that on which he was at his best, and his speech was the event of the afternoon. 'I have received your note with deep regret and considerable uneasiness on more than one account,' Mr. Grote wrote just before one of these occasions, when owing to some clashing of dates and duties the Chancellor had had to excuse himself and ask the Vice-Chancellor to replace him.

'If it be really a matter of necessity, I must of course take your place and do the duty as well as I can; but if it be not a matter of *strict* necessity, I would beg you to reconsider the case. As Vice-Chancellor, I can relieve you from all trouble about the detail and management of the University; and I am perfectly willing to do so. But for the periodical solemnities, the effect of your presence and discourse is such as I cannot in any way supply: the more so, as your discourses have in every successive year been admirably suited to the occasion, and have produced an excellent effect. I have heard them always remarked upon in the most favourable manner. It is neither flattery nor false modesty which makes me speak when I

[1] Lord Granville to Lord Hartington, October 29, 1879.

say, that the scene presided over by me in your place will be terribly flat and disappointing.

'I shall be very glad to hear that you can overcome this necessity. I assure you that the case is one which demands an *effort* to do so. I will add that the fatigue of the ceremony is something which I really dread. This is the one day in the year on which your presence as Chancellor is all but indispensable.'

CHAPTER XVI

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

1862–1864

> Ein garstig Lied ! Pfui ! ein politisch Lied !
> Ein leidig Lied ! Dank Gott mit jedem Morgen,
> Dass ihr nicht braucht fürs Röm'sche Reich zu sorgen !
> Ich halt' es wenigstens für reichlichen Gewinn,
> Dass ich nicht Kaiser oder Kanzler bin.
> Doch muss auch uns ein Oberhaupt nicht fehlen.
>
> GOETHE, *Faust.*

ILL success in the early part of 1862 continued to beset the Federal generals and armies in America. The Emperor of the French, who had plunged his army into Mexico, fearing, and as the event proved with reason, that the Federal arms might nevertheless be eventually successful, and that their success might prove fatal to his wild adventure, desired to take advantage of the situation as it then stood in order to offer mediation, and to recognise the Southern Confederacy as a Sovereign State in the event of a refusal by the Government at Washington. Lord Granville had supported Lord Russell in declining to allow an English force to join the French expedition in their march into the interior of Mexico. The dangerous and uncertain character of the aim of this expedition from the very commencement deeply impressed itself on the mind of the British Cabinet, and the catastrophe in which it ended served to create a permanent opinion against dashes into distant and almost unknown lands, with no clear idea or determinate policy as to the objects to be gained. Lord Granville's own letters show how when twenty years afterwards the question of an expedition into Egypt—still more

of an expedition into the Soudan—was mooted, the story of the siege of Puebla and the tragedy at Queretaro, of the protracted guerilla warfare and the consequent disorganisation of the French army which was so vitally to affect the result of the Franco-German War, were memories constantly present to him and his colleagues.

But if Lord Russell wisely declined to go an inch beyond Vera Cruz, he showed signs of favouring the proposed mediation between the belligerents further North; and Lord Granville had to intervene to prevent a step the consequences of which would have been almost as incalculable as a plunge into Mexico itself. It was premature in his opinion to assume that the fortune of war had as yet proved itself to be decisively on the side of the South. A rather bellicose letter reached him at Gotha from the Foreign Minister, whom he had succeeded there in September as Minister in attendance on the Queen. It happened that at the moment he was reading a history of Lorraine. Out of the pages of the book he took occasion to remind Lord Russell, to whose mind an historical analogy always recommended itself, how in 1636 the Imperial armies invaded France, and began by marching rapidly upon Paris.[1] They were opposed by no great army nor by any very skilful general; but they were obliged to retreat. The French then in their turn tried to invade Lorraine; a province at the time defended neither by large armies nor by considerable fortresses. They were defeated through the resistance of one small town. The Imperialists in their turn again invaded France, and were themselves unexpectedly stopped by the gallant defence of another small town.[2] The moral to be derived from these abortive campaigns and their uncertain issue might, Lord Granville

[1] The allusion is to the events of the later part or 'third period' of the Thirty Years' War, when, after the battle of Nördlingen, France entered into the struggle; and Lorraine, Alsace, and what is now the East of France, became the scene of operations.

[2] The town is St. Jean de Losne, which in 1636 drove back the Imperial armies from Burgundy and saved France. Its inhabitants in consequence were set free from taxation and enjoyed the immunity till the Revolution. An account of St. Jean de Losne will be found in Miss Betham-Edwards's *East of Paris*.

thought, be deemed not inapplicable to the fortunes of the American War, and to point to perseverance in the policy of watching events which hitherto had been pursued by the British Government, rather than to any premature plunge into partisan action.[1]

'John Russell [he wrote to Lord Stanley of Alderley] has sent me a message announcing a Cabinet, to consider whether we should offer to mediate, and in case of refusal to recognise the Confederates. Palmerston had already said something to me on the subject. I have written to Johnny my reasons for thinking it decidedly premature. I, however, suspect you will settle to do so! Pam, Johnny, and Gladstone would be in favour of it; and probably Newcastle. I do not know about the others. It appears to me a great mistake.'[2]

In a letter to Lord Russell he recorded his opinions at greater length. Fortunately for the peace of the world and for the future relations of Great Britain and the United States, his views at the decisive moment, though he was not present to support them in person, proved to be those of the majority of the Cabinet; and there is every reason to suppose of the Queen also, who 'had an instinctive dread of war and of all foreign complications likely to result in war.'[3] The letter to Lord Russell ran as follows:—

LORD GRANVILLE TO LORD RUSSELL.

GOTHA, *September* 27, 1862.

'MY DEAR LORD JOHN,—Meade has given me your message, viz. that the Cabinet is likely to be summoned to consider the present state of the American question: whether the time is not come to offer the mediation of H.M.'s Government, and in case of refusal to recognise the Southern Confederacy. When I last saw Lord Palmerston, he mentioned the subject to me, so that I have had time to think over it.

[1] Lord Granville to Lord Russell, September 27, 1862; Lord Palmerston to Lord Russell, September 14, 1862; Lord Russell to Lord Palmerston, September 17, 1862.

[2] Lord Granville to Lord Stanley of Alderley, October 1, 1862.

[3] See the *Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society*, II, October 1903, and IV, December 1903 to January 1904, pp. 123–152 and 439–458, where the subject is discussed in an article by the President, Mr. C. F. Adams.

'If we were asked to mediate, we could not refuse. The North hate us now; the Southern leaders did hate us, and may for all we know do so now or hereafter; and therefore we might selfishly argue that it was not politically disadvantageous to us that both parties should exhaust themselves a little more before they make peace. It would, however, be monstrous not to avail ourselves of a good opportunity to put an end to the crimes and calamities which are now desolating North America, and inflicting at the same time injury on our commerce and manufactures. But the difficulties of mediation are great. Public opinion in England is diametrically opposed to that of both Northern and Southern statesmen on slavery. The questions of boundary are of vital importance not only to the North and South, but to the West. The negotiations would have to be carried on in common with the French, who, although they want cotton, are partial to the North. I doubt whether any European Government really understands American politics, or the objects of the North and of the South, and of the different states once released from the hope of preserving the Great Union; or the views of the different important parties in the Republic.

'I doubt whether, in offering to mediate, we should do so with any *bonâ-fide* expectation of its being accepted. If either or both parties wished for mediation, we should certainly have had some (more or less direct) intimation of it.

'It is possible that one or both belligerents might accept the offer of mediation, not with a view to peace, nor with the intention of making concessions mutually acceptable, but for the purpose of gaining time, intriguing politically and renewing their military resources. In that case we should be dupes; we should give false hopes of a supply of cotton, and destroy the *stimulus*, which although painful at the moment is likely to be so beneficial for the future by giving us supplies from our own possessions and other parts of the world.

'The probability is that our offers would be refused by one or both belligerents, as such offers generally are when made before they are wanted. If the South refuses, which in consistency with their public declarations, repudiating all foreign interference, they ought to do, it would be hardly a reason for recognising them. If the North alone refused, the question would then naturally arise, whether we ought not then to recognise the South. Such a recognition, as has been explained several times to Parliament by the Government, would not by itself remove the blockade, or supply us with cotton. It would give no physical strength to the South, but it would greatly stimulate the North and undoubtedly assist their Government in raising men and money. By the time you will receive this letter,

you will probably know more of the relative positions of the combatants. At present we know that the Federals have been defeated in their attempt to conquer the South, but we also know that the two parties have changed parts in the great tragedy. The Southerners, instead of being invaded, are become the invaders.

'It would not be a good moment to recognise the South just before a great Federal success. If, on the other hand, the Confederates continue victorious, as it is to be hoped, we should stand better then than now in recognising them.

'In any case I doubt, if the war continues long after our recognition of the South, whether it will be possible for us to avoid drifting into it. The expectation of an immediate supply of the best cotton will have been raised in this country. The dislike which now exists between us will be much increased. The North will become desperate, and even against their intentions will give us innumerable *casus belli*. The result of such a war under present circumstances is not doubtful, but much valuable blood would be unnecessarily spilt, infinitely more treasure would be spent than is sufficient to maintain the cotton operatives during their temporary distress; and whether the French went with us or not, it is not unlikely that circumstances might arise which would enable the Emperor more freely to adopt any foreign policy either in Italy or elsewhere which might suit him.

'I am afraid your message was not intended to produce such a long rigmarole, but you will see by it that I have come to the conclusion that it is premature to depart from the policy which has hitherto been adopted by you and Lord Palmerston, and which, notwithstanding the strong antipathy to the North, the strong sympathy with the South, and the passionate wish to have cotton, has met with such general approval from Parliament, the press, and the public.

'Yours sincerely,

'GRANVILLE.'

So ended this unwise attempt at intervention. But the danger of a rupture with the United States had hardly been averted, when a cloud arose in the East of Europe. Poland was once more in insurrection. The Emperor of the French and the nation over which he reigned had strong Polish sympathies.[1] A similar state of feeling existed in England and found an echo in the hearts of the 'two ancient masters,' whose bellicose tendencies the Queen was now intervening to check.

[1] See above, ch. v. p. 121.

Whatever were the treaty rights of Europe under the stipulations of 1815 in regard to intervention in Poland, whatever were the merits or the demerits of the Poles as a nation, and whether they had or had not brought their troubles on their own heads, diplomatic intervention without the support of Austria or Prussia seemed to Lord Granville an act of madness ; while to encourage the idea that military intervention might take place, even failing the support of those Powers, would only be a cruel and misleading invitation to the Poles to persevere in a hopeless struggle. Lord Palmerston and Lord Russell could not deny that the strength of the military position of Russia in Poland was very different in point of solidity from the former hold of Austria on Italy, and that without the co-operation of Austria and Prussia nothing effectual could be done to aid the insurrection. But they further ignored the fact that whatever might be true in regard to the possibility of Austrian support, connivance even by Prussia was out of the question. Poland was then, as it still is, the hinge on which Prussian foreign policy turns. Ever since the first partition, to avoid a conflict with Russia has been the policy of the Prussian Foreign Office and the inherited tradition of her Royal Family. The Minister whom William I. had just called to his councils, already contemplating that he might shortly have to open a new and perilous chapter of German and European history, which might bring him into collision with Austria and France, was determined under no circumstances whatever to risk a struggle with Russia. He, on the contrary, intended to obtain a solid guarantee of her future goodwill, with an eye to coming events. To stand rigidly aloof from European intervention in the affairs of Poland was the obvious method to gain his end, especially as this policy would have the additional advantage of separating Russia from France, should France join in the proposed intervention.

GENERAL GREY TO LORD GRANVILLE.

BALMORAL, *June* 1, 1863.

'MY DEAR GRANVILLE,—The Queen hopes you have seen Lord Cowley's last despatches, and a letter to Lord Russell, in which he reports a conversation with the Emperor in the course of which his Majesty spoke of the only two alternatives being a conference or a *rupture with Russia*. Her Majesty is getting a good deal alarmed, and I think justly, lest matters should progress insensibly towards such a position as would enable the Emperor to indulge his desire for such a rupture, and deprive us of the power of interfering to prevent it. She hopes, therefore, that the Cabinet will carefully consider every step that is now taken, and she has sent back a draft on the subject of a conference and a "cessation of hostilities," with the expression of her hope that it has been considered by the Cabinet as well as seen by Lord Palmerston, and pointing out the necessity, in her opinion, of exercising *extreme* caution in all we do now. In confirmation of the view she takes, her Majesty wishes you also to see the inclosed extract of a letter she has received from the King of the Belgians. 'Believe me, ever yours truly,

'C. GREY.'

(*Inclosure.*)

EXTRACT OF LETTER FROM THE KING OF THE BELGIANS TO THE QUEEN.

'About Poland the English Cabinet must be prudent. The question divides itself into two parts: what may be done for the kingdom as it existed till 1831, and for *l'unité Polonaise* brought forward by Garibaldi for these people. It would be impossible for the Emperor Alexander to give up these provinces, which, one must say, are prosperous, and have been now Russian for a long period. Their existence will be improved, as truly much has been already done in that way. But the Russians as a nation will never and can never submit to give them up. To carry on a war for that purpose, would for England be a fool's play. If a Poland as the Garibaldians wish it could be restored, it would be in *close alliance with France*; and Prussia, particularly between the French on the Rhine and a French province on the Vistula, *could not exist*. It would be completely *nullified*. Austria would also get such a dangerous set of people near Hungary, that it would find itself in the same position.

'England has a vital interest, for its own security, that those two Powers should continue to maintain their existence; because who is to come forward, if they are unable to do so? If Austria, at its cost,

had not made Napoleon leave Boulogne, England would have been placed in a position of considerable danger. As our Angel said with great truth, all these questions are now merely used almost for *personal* purposes, to make capital of, and the real interests sacrificed to that.[1] One says with great truth, when the French make that phrase, "Il n'y a que la France qui combat pour une idée." "Oui, c'est vrai, et cette idée n'est autre que de prendre ce qui est aux voisins."'

'I do not desire war,' said Prince Napoleon in the peroration of his speech on Poland in the French Senate on March 17; 'but,' he went on, 'neither do I desire peace.' The criticism to which this policy laid itself open was only too obvious; unfortunately it applied to Lord Russell's despatches, as well as to Prince Napoleon's speeches. The Cabinet, as might have been foreseen, had to be content with giving platonic advice to Russia, with the result that at the end of the diplomatic campaign Russia had become bound by ties of gratitude to Prussia for having refused to take part in it, while the previous good understanding between France and Russia was shattered. The remnants of good feeling between France and England were also still further reduced by the curt manner in which Lord Russell refused to accept the French Emperor's proposal—an impracticable proposal, it must be admitted—to cover their defeat in the Polish negotiations by summoning a congress to consider the European situation as a whole. The net result was that both Great Britain and France were felt to have lost heavily in public estimation.

In the autumn of 1863 the Queen was in Germany. The Polish war cloud had passed away, though the diplomatic campaign still continued. The visit of the Queen was not occasioned by family ties merely. After the formation of the German Confederation by the treaties of Vienna under

[1] See on the opinions of the Prince Consort as to Poland, Humboldt to Varnhagen, February 27, 1847. *Letters of Alexander von Humboldt*, p. 182. (Trübner & Co., London, 1860.) On the German policy of the Prince Consort see Treitschke, *Deutsche Geschichte*, iv. 83; *Bunsen's Life*, ii. 189, 275, 362, 498; Martin's *Life of the Prince Consort*, iv. 490, v. 62–69, 344–346; *Vitzthum Memoirs*, ii. 15–20. A useful summary will be found in the article 'Queen Victoria and Germany,' by 'Diplomaticus,' in the *Fortnightly Review* for March 1901.

the impulse of the patriotic struggle against Napoleon, the Constitution then created had not proved much more satisfactory than that of the deceased Holy Roman Empire. With only a verbal modification as to the names, the soldier's song in *Faust* might still have been sung, and the question it asked still remained unanswered :

> Das liebe heil'ge Röm'sche Reich
> Wie hält's nur noch zusammen ?

As in the days before the French Revolution, schemes of every kind were on foot for patching up the tumbling edifice. The mutual jealousies of Prussia, Austria, and the lesser States were as active as ever. On the death of Frederick William IV. a new *régime* had in January 1861 begun in Prussia with the accession of William I. ; and the acceptance of office by Count Bismarck in the September of 1862 marked the new departure still more emphatically, though the world but dimly suspected at the moment all that the advent of the new minister implied. The Prince Consort, so far *felix opportunitate mortis*, died without having lived to see his plans for the creation of a reformed but Liberal Germany hopelessly shattered. Austria was as usual involved in a constitutional crisis ; Count Beust was trying to direct a German policy from the Saxon capital ; and the 'lansquenets of politics,' as Treitschke afterwards called the Ministers and ex-Ministers of the smaller Courts, Dalwigh, Von der Pfordten, and—by far the ablest—Von Roggenbach, each and all had a plan of his own for introducing some kind of order into the confusion.[1] Lord Granville when again attending the Queen in 1863 found himself at the centre of this busy hive of political intrigue and personal jealousy.

In addition to the troubles of Germany itself, the Schleswig-Holstein question seemed again about to enter upon an active phase, for the succession to the Elbe Duchies was certain to be disputed on the death of the King of Denmark, Frederick VII., an event which it was known could not be long delayed. All through 1860, 1861, and 1862, despatches had been passing

[1] Guilland, *L'Allemagne Nouvelle et ses Historiens*, p. 241.

and appeals had been made to Denmark in order to secure some arrangement which might avert a rupture.[1] The German Bund considered that it would be entitled to proceed to Federal execution if Denmark were to refuse to recognise the constitutional claims put forward by German advocates on behalf of the two Duchies, which were claimed as indivisible and German, and were to treat as null and void the negotiations subsequent to the Treaty of 1852, which they urged ought to have been submitted to the Estates of the Duchies. A refusal to do so again, the Bund considered, might affect the title of the successor to the Danish throne to claim the succession of the Duchies. But diplomacy laboured in vain. When the death of the King actually took place on November 15, 1863, the strife at once became acute, as the Duchies were treated as a convenient arena by all the rival parties in Germany, each of whom hoped thereby to promote ulterior objects of their own in home affairs.

On July 31, 1863, the Emperor of Austria had invited the German Sovereigns to a Congress at Frankfurt to discuss the internal situation. The King of Prussia declined to meet him there; but notwithstanding this refusal, the Sovereigns of the other German States, after several preliminary meetings between their plenipotentiaries, accepted the Austrian invitation and discussed a plan of Federal reform. Of these varied intrigues and complicated negotiations, Lord Granville was a close observer. Lord Clarendon was also in Germany, and equally watchful of what was passing.

'I paid Clarendon a visit at Wiesbaden [Lord Granville wrote to Lord Stanley of Alderley]. Uncommonly agreeable: the link between Hammond of the Foreign Office, Mrs. Hammond, and several Miss Hammonds, with a very sporting set: Maidstone, Dunkellin, Annerley, Cecil Boothby, Ernest Bruce, Bobby Brownrigg, and Ouseley Higgins. Maidstone charmed with his Paris *coiffeur*, who told him it was a real pleasure to cut such a *chevelure*. Maidstone suggested the colour was a pity.

'"Ah non, monsieur, cela fait ressortir vos traits." He is still prouder of all he said on the road. To one railway traveller he defined their respective positions in life.

[1] *Parliamentary Papers*, 1861, lxv. 69, 145; lxxiv. 305.

'"Moi je suis Pair d'Angleterre ; vous, vous êtes un cochon." To a stranger next to him at the roulette table—

'"C'est mon argent."

'"Pardon, monsieur, c'est le mien."

'"Vous mentez."

'"Mais, monsieur, c'est mon argent."

'"Vous mentez dans votre gorge ; vous êtes un échappé du bagne de Toulon."

'Hammond told me that he had telegraphed to John Russell to suggest Clarendon being sent to Frankfurt. The answer came while I was there. Clarendon was delighted and answered, "Yes, though it was at a great personal sacrifice!" I thought it better only to stay one afternoon at Frankfurt, and only saw the Dukes of Cambridge and Coburg, Princess Alice, and a few Dips. At that moment it was the day after the Emperor's arrival and everybody very sanguine. I imagine this has all much cooled down. Everybody seems charmed with the Emperor's manner, and he is said to have presided at the several meetings with great tact. He has been especially civil to Clarendon and the Duke of Cambridge. Nothing can be done without Prussia, and she will never consent to anything which does not give her more preponderance than the Southern States will admit. The King as usual has been clumsy. It is illogical to admit the existence of the present evils, the necessity of curing them, and then —when everybody else concerned agrees to meet and deliberate on the remedy—to abstain. I fancy he will outbid them by some more liberal proposal. The Princess Royal was very interesting. She is very Prussian on this Confederation question. Prussia has by her foreign and home policy put herself so completely out of court, that one hardly knows what she can do. I am afraid that Germany is bent on action in Denmark. Palmerston writes flourishing accounts of the condition of "our fatherland." . . .

'I met the Grande Duchesse Hélène: clever but a little too blue and pretentious. She is the one who asked Ashley—

'"You are the son of Lord Shaftesbury?"

'"Oui."

'"Are you associated with him in his good works?"

'"Oui."

'"What particular good work engrosses your attention at this moment?"

'No answer.'[1]

[1] Frederica Charlotte Marie, daughter of Prince Paul of Würtemberg, born January 9, 1807, married the Grand Duke Michael on February 19, 1824. The

A few days after, Lord Granville continued the narrative of his German experiences from Coburg in a note to Lord Stanley of Alderley, then at St. Petersburg.

'The King of Prussia paid the Queen a visit of a few hours. He alighted at the Rosenau station. His Majesty spoke to me for a few minutes on matters of no importance, and I thought purposely avoided politics. His Majesty, however, later took me aside, and observed that there was a great crisis in German affairs ; stated that he had been completely taken by surprise; that at Gastein he had learnt from the Emperor only the outlines of his proposal; that he had in conversation made his objections, and repeated them in writing, when to his great astonishment he received immediately afterwards a formal invitation to attend the Conference. His Majesty did not know whether the Frankfurt proposals would be communicated to him ; but in that case he did not believe his counter-proposals would be accepted. His Majesty was suddenly called away : the Queen being already in the carriage. The King's aide-de-camp told me that M. de Bismarck was waiting for me at Coburg ; that he did not like to come to Rosenau ; and asked whether I would join him. As he was saying this, M. de Bismarck appeared, and I had an hour's conversation with him in the garden. He went away without asking to be presented to the Queen or to anyone else. M. de Bismarck said that he wished to speak to me for two reasons : (1) his general wish that England and Prussia should be good friends ; and (2) that he had been told that Mr. Layard had told the Prussian Secretary of Legation that the English Government approved of the Austrian proposals at Frankfurt.' [1]

Lord Granville conveyed his own impressions to Lord Palmerston also by letter.

'Nothing [Lord Palmerston replied] will probably come of the Frankfurt Congress, but it is a step in the right direction, and may be the forerunner of some good and useful arrangement. No doubt anything tending to German unity would be disagreeable to France, but would not give France any just pretence for attacking Belgium or Prussia, and if unity was in any military sense accomplished, it would make French aggression towards the Rhine more difficult. France has a tough job on her hands in Mexico, which will last her for some time to come, as it is difficult to guess whether she will be

Grand Duke died in 1849. The Princess was known after her marriage by the title of the Grande Duchesse Hélène of Russia.

[1] Lord Granville to Lord Stanley of Alderley, August 30, 1863.

able to establish there sufficient tranquillity and order to induce Maximilian to accept and to go.'[1]

While Lord Granville was in Germany with the Queen, he was greatly alarmed to hear that, notwithstanding the refusal by Denmark to entertain the proposals of Lord Russell for a reform of the relations existing between that kingdom and the Elbe Duchies, Lord Palmerston had taken an opportunity to say from his place in the House of Commons :—

'We are convinced—I am convinced at least—that if any violent attempt were made to overthrow the rights and to interfere with the independence of Denmark, those who made the attempt would find in the result that it would not be Denmark alone with which they would have to contend.'[2]

These were grave words, and they were received with loud applause in the House, and by a large and influential section of the London public, whose invincible want of knowledge of German affairs was one of the perils of the moment.

'It is quite entertaining [Baron de Bunsen had written just before the Crimean War] to see the stiff unbelief of the English in the future of Germany. Lord John is merely uninformed. Peel staggered the mind of the excellent Prince by his unbelief; yet he has a statesman-like good-will towards the Germanic nations, and even for the Germanic nation. Aberdeen is the greatest sinner; he believes in God and the Emperor Nicolas.'[3]

Though Lord Aberdeen was not now Prime Minister, the same state of things on the whole still unfortunately existed, even although Lord Russell had shown anxiety to enlarge the circle of his ideas about Germany since the days of the Crimean War.[4] From Lord Derby and Lord Ellenborough there was even less to hope than from Lord Palmerston. Nor was the nation at large one whit better informed. An ignorant contempt which talked of a war with Germany as a thing which might be undertaken with a light heart, gave the prevailing note to the conversation of London society,

[1] Lord Palmerston to Lord Granville, August 23, 1863. The French had taken the city of Mexico on June 5, 1863.

[2] *Hansard*, clxxvi. 716.

[3] *Life of Bunsen*, ii. 189.

[4] Martin, *Life of the Prince Consort*, v. 62.

and was unfortunately shared by the two leading ministers. The Queen had accordingly to look to the younger members of the Cabinet for support against this general hostility to Germany and the unwise 'lightness of heart' which existed. Concurring in the accuracy of her view of the situation, Lord Granville had, however, to warn the Queen of the necessity of extreme caution in the midst of a noisy and excited opinion. 'The Queen is up in her stirrups,' he told Lord Clarendon, 'very German,' and determined if necessary to resist the Prime Minister. 'I was obliged to hint that it was a question on which she could not hope to be omnipotent.'[1] But subject to this wise caution he threw his influence strongly on the royal side in favour of a peaceful attitude, and against alienating German sympathy by making the British nation, at least through its official representatives, a partisan of the Danish view of the current controversy, thereby depriving the Foreign Office of the strength which impartiality alone could afford to a mediator.

The Schleswig-Holstein question was darkened by a vast mass of irrelevant learning.[2] The controversy was said to date from the Charter of King Gorm the Old, a monarch who reigned in Denmark in the ninth century; but the truth was expressed in the saying that the question really existed because commercial bills in the Duchies were drawn upon Hamburg and not upon Copenhagen. If the settlement of the Duchies and the future development of Germany generally had been left to depend on the complicated plans of the erudite circles in which Baron de Bunsen had held so distinguished a place, Lord Palmerston would perhaps not now be charged with having shown want of foresight in 1862. These were the plans with which, whether in the hands of the famous ambassador and theologian or in those of the Ministers of the smaller German Courts, the public mind was principally familiar, and by them it judged the

[1] Lord Granville to Lord Clarendon, August 3, 1863.

[2] A summary will be found in an article contributed by the Marquess of Salisbury to the *Quarterly Review* in 1864 and published in his collected essays, ii. 64.

German nation. That there was something beyond all this was neither imagined nor believed, nor was it understood that even the plans in question were not the mere spider's webs of garrulous professors, but the expression of an active national opinion. Lord Palmerston, on the one hand, thought Prussia too weak and too divided to be honest and independent in her action; on the other hand, he did not desire to see Germany pass absolutely under Austrian hegemony. While he recognised that a strong Prussia was essential to German strength, he did not see how a strong Prussia was to be created, and probably in his heart believed that the history of German unity—to borrow an image made familiar by Goerres—might be that of the great Gothic cathedral of Cologne, begun, half finished, and never completed—the living picture in stone of the desolation and confusion of the country.[1] The older generation of European statesmen had known the Germany of the Romantic movement with its mediæval and unpractical aims; they had noticed how the greatest German of any time had stood serenely aloof from the struggles and enthusiasms of his countrymen; they had seen Frederick William III. and Frederick William IV. on the throne of Frederick the Great; they had witnessed the humiliation of Prussia in 1850 at Olmütz, and they had too readily appraised the liberal plans of the Prince Consort as representing a policy unable to realise itself in action. It was concealed from their vision that Europe was on the verge of another and a different era; that the glories of Rosbach and Leipzig were about to be renewed; that a new race of great warriors and practical statesmen was in existence, and that under the leadership of the aged King, who in his early youth had himself served against Napoleon, they were within a few years to astonish a world incapable of divining their existence. Of the Germany that was coming into being under the teaching of Sybel and Treitschke, 'who had brought historical teaching into contact with real life, and had created a public opinion

[1] See the letter of Lord Palmerston to Lord Russell, September 1865, *Life of Palmerston*, v. 270.

more powerful than the laws, and had entirely remodelled the methods of thought of the generation then springing into manhood,' the elder generation of English statesmen had no inkling, and if Lord Granville saw more clearly and escaped the current delusions, he probably owed it in no small degree to the influence and conversation of Sir John Acton.[1]

Notwithstanding an appeal made for delay by Lord Russell and an attempt by the Emperor of the French to assemble a congress in Paris, a Federal execution was decreed by the Diet, and the troops of the Confederation entered Holstein in December 1863.[2] A few weeks more and war was declared by Prussia and Austria against Denmark, the Prussian army under Marshal von Wrangel crossing the Elbe early in January 1864, quickly followed by their Austrian allies. They overran the Duchy, and the Federal army of execution was rudely pushed aside. Thus far, however, no diplomatic criticism could be perhaps made, for the patent of March 30, 1863, relating to Holstein, which had been almost the last act of the dying King of Denmark, was a matter which certainly affected German interests, nobody disputing that Holstein was a part of Germany, whatever might be the case with Schleswig. But when contrary to official assurances the Austro-Prussian invasion extended itself to Schleswig and even into Jutland, the whole position was altered.

Lord Russell had addressed an appeal to Denmark to induce her to revoke the November Constitution, which had been the first act of the new reign and pointed to a practical incorporation of Schleswig with the Kingdom.[3] If his recommendations were accepted by Denmark and refused by the German Powers, he and Lord Palmerston were ready to risk war in order to support the title of the new King, Christian IX., under the Treaty of London of 1852, to the succession

[1] The above quotation is from Lord Acton's introduction to the first number of the *English Historical Review*.

[2] *Parliamentary Papers*, lxiv. (No. 2) 144, 145.

[3] *Ibid.* 1864, lxiv. 561, 565.

of the Duchies as well as to the Kingdom. In September 1863 he had already felt his way, though ineffectually, towards joint action with France. Soon afterwards he himself again rejected the advances of the Emperor for a congress.[1] Western Europe was therefore divided. The Queen was of opinion that in what was known as the Scandinavian idea, the best way was ultimately to be found out of the imbroglio.

'Let it be agreed upon by Europe [she had written in a memorandum sent to Lord Granville] that at King Christian's death and that of the King of Sweden, Prince Frederick of Denmark, having married the King of Sweden's daughter, should succeed to the three Northern kingdoms, which would thus make a strong Northern power, independent of Russia, and be a good barrier against that Empire, and the Duchies could then be placed under their lawful Duke. It must and will come to that; and if *we* helped it, that large Northern kingdom would be friendly to us, whereas the two Duchies will never leave a moment's peace to Denmark if they are forced to belong to her.'[2]

These, however, were ulterior considerations. The immediate question was how to terminate the war, and thereby prevent Great Britain becoming involved in it. Parliament was about to assemble, and as yet Denmark showed no sign of accepting Lord Russell's proposals.

THE QUEEN TO LORD GRANVILLE.

OSBORNE, *January* 27, 1864.

'The Queen has seen the repeated answers to our proposals, respecting the concert with the non-German Powers and material aid to Denmark, from France, which is decidedly against any promise of material aid. The Emperor and M. Drouyn de l'Huys say: "We wish to maintain the treaty, but if the alternative is maintaining it or a conflagration in Europe, we prefer to modify or cancel it, rather than a conflagration:" to which the Queen must subscribe. Russia has told Denmark not to resist, as she can expect no material aid from Russia. All this would show that we are safe from this perilous proposal; but Lord Russell, to whom the Queen observed this, said: "There is Sweden, and she might join us." These words alarmed the Queen, and she wishes to warn Lord Granville and the Cabinet of what may be proposed. Lord Russell is evidently very uneasy and

[1] *Parliamentary Papers*, 1864, lxiv. 130. [2] January 9, 1864.

very sore at the failure of all the endless proposals on the part of this country. We have done too much, been too active, and done ourselves no good. We are, alas ! detested in Germany.

'The one really very serious feature in the whole affair is that everywhere the Governments have been outvoted, and that we, constitutional England, are asking them to act in an unconstitutional way.

'The Queen asks the Cabinet to be firm and support her. Lord Russell is very fair, but Lord Palmerston alarms him and overrules him. The Cabinet must also insist on no violent declaration in the Speech which would force us to be partisans of one side, or of a determination to maintain the treaty at all hazards. Lord Palmerston should likewise be strongly urged to be very cautious in Parliament, for any encouragement to Denmark would be fatal.

'Lord Granville, while not mentioning this communication, may use the Queen's name whenever he thinks it may be useful. If Lord Granville thinks it necessary, the Queen is ready to write anything to the above effect to Lord Russell.'

By the treaty of May 8, 1852, the integrity of the Danish Kingdom, including the Duchies, had been guaranteed by the Powers; but it was precisely this arrangement which German opinion most resented.

General Grey to Lord Granville.

Osborne, *February* 1, 1864.

'My dear Granville,—I have just telegraphed to Lord Palmerston by the Queen's desire, to say she assents to the Speech, as proposed, with the exception of one short paragraph respecting Germany. She is now writing some remarks to go by messenger. It would have been useless, as she is to see him so soon, or she would have been tempted to tell him that nothing could bring out the iniquity and arbitrary nature of the Treaty in greater relief than this Speech, for it simply affirms that the Powers of Europe had assumed the right of making territorial and dynastic arrangements (as they did in 1815) without any reference to the wishes of the people who are to be affected by them.

'Lord Palmerston also forgets (in the passage to which H.M. objects) that several of the States of Germany expressly repudiated the Treaty, and that as it was never accepted by or even submitted to the States of either Holstein or Schleswig, he ought not to be surprised if, instead of tending to preserve the peace of Europe, it should prove to be the occasion of war.

'I don't know if you are one of those who can be amused by Carlyle, as I am. But I wish you would look at his graphic account of "Britannic Majesty's sorrows" at the time of the war respecting the Pragmatic Sanction. George II.'s indignation at the repudiation of treaties. The "fussy *little gentleman*" (some such term he uses) rushing frantically about to this Power and to that: "Will *you* perhaps do a little fighting—will *you*—will *you*?" and overruling at last Walpole's sensible advice, "Stay at home and eat your pudding."[1] I suppose the fighting will commence—such fighting as there will be—in a day or two. The best hope of peace seems to me now to be that the Germans shall advance as quickly as possible, in such overpowering force as to reduce the actual fighting to a minimum—and that, satisfied with the occupation of Schleswig, they shall then consent to negotiate. Depend upon it the only *possible* compromise is the restoration of the old connection between Holstein and Schleswig (a genealogy sent to the Queen shows that these Duchies were connected long before either was united to Denmark), and the consent of the King to hold them simply as Duke, independently of the kingdom. The only other alternative—fight as you will about it—is their total separation from Denmark, and the creation of the Scandinavian Kingdom, for which Napoleon and Charles of Sweden both wish, and which is I believe equally the object of the Eyder-Dane party at Copenhagen.[2] 'Ever yours truly, C. G.'

The Queen attained her object, and the paragraph with a bellicose note in it, to which the Queen objected, was struck out of the draft of the Royal Speech.

THE QUEEN TO LORD GRANVILLE.

OSBORNE, *February* 12, 1864.

'The Queen has heard nothing from Lord Granville, so she trusts all is going on quietly. The Queen has enjoyed comparative quiet since Schleswig-Holstein has been taken out of *our* hands, and she trusts—sad and distressing as this war is—that it may be entirely localised and soon over.

'The negotiations will be very difficult, for the Queen fears that the Duchies will never consent to belong, even with a personal union

[1] Carlyle, *Frederick the Great*, Book xii. ch. 12.

[2] This party proposed to incorporate Schleswig with Denmark, leaving everything south of the Eyder to Germany. The Danish patent of November, which was said to incorporate Schleswig, had been made by Prussia and Austria their *casus belli*.

only, to the King of Denmark; and we cannot force them to take a Sovereign who is hateful to them! England must be consistent, whatever else she may do. This personal union is, however, the Queen thinks the only thing that can be tried, and this should be guaranteed by all the Powers, and the whole of Germany! Nothing else can even be thought of.

'War, the Queen hopes and thinks, no one dreams of in this country; but the Queen was startled by a draft to Lord Napier received this evening, of which the passage she incloses is the concluding paragraph.[1] She therefore intends to draw Lord Russell's attention to it. She would feel it her duty in the interests of this country and of the peace of Europe to resist any proposal for war. The only chance of preserving peace for Europe is by not assisting Denmark, who has brought this entirely upon herself, and who, the Queen believes, would now even resist fulfilling her promises! Denmark is after all of less vital importance than the peace of Europe, and it would be madness to set the whole Continent on fire for the imaginary advantages of maintaining the integrity of Denmark. Lord Palmerston and the Emperor Nicholas are the cause of all the present trouble by framing that wretched Treaty of 1852.

'The Queen suffers much, and her nerves are more and more totally shattered, and her rest broken. . . . If Lord Granville only reflects, he will understand how terrible her position is! But though all this anxiety is wearing her out, it will not shake her in her firm purpose of resisting any attempt to involve this country in a mad and useless combat. The Queen returns to Windsor on the 19th or 20th.

'The Queen relies on the support of the Cabinet. When all seems dark around, then she feels her faith and strength strongest in God's mercy and protection. . . .'

Lord Granville was careful, as in 1859, to avoid appearing to trench in any way on the rights of the Prime Minister and the Foreign Secretary in his communications with the Queen.[2] But he was able to reassure the Queen as to any doubts which may have been entertained by her of the presence in the Cabinet of the advocates of a peaceful policy and their intention to be heard.

[1] Lord Napier was Ambassador at St. Petersburg.

[2] 'Your Majesty will readily understand,' he wrote on another occasion of the same kind in 1885, 'what an extremely delicate matter it is for Lord Granville to enter into any question as to the relations between your Majesty and Mr. Gladstone. Your Majesty may rely on perfect frankness from Lord Granville in any matter which concerns himself.'

OSBORNE, *February* 14, 1864.

'The Queen thanks Lord Granville for his reassuring letter. She can only repeat that she is so thoroughly convinced of the awful danger and recklessness of our stirring up France and Russia to go to war, that she would be prepared to make a stand upon it, should it even cause the resignation of Lord Russell.

'There are duties and convictions so sacred and so strong that they outweigh all other considerations; but the Queen will not say this till Lord Granville tells her there is danger of anything of the kind, but she is quite determined upon it, solely from a regard to the safety of this country and of Europe in general. Another point upon which the Queen is equally determined is, that when we do go into a conference, to consent to no arrangement which is not agreed to by the whole of Germany and by the Duchies themselves; for we must not commit a second time the grievous fault of signing away other people's rights and of handing over people themselves to a Sovereign to whom they owe no allegiance. The Danes themselves (by which the Queen does not mean the King, who seems powerless, and would willingly do all he could to satisfy Germany) seem utterly unmanageable, and if we wish to end this unlucky war, we must not let them imagine they will be assisted in their reckless course. If we had all along (that is from the time the Danes began to disregard their promises) put pressure upon them, we should have prevented what has occurred now; for the Government at Copenhagen is in the hands of a most violent party who are utterly regardless of consequences.

'Though the Queen said she would not declare her determination to prevent her subjects from being involved in war—recklessly and uselessly—Lord Granville is quite at liberty to make use of her opinion on this subject when speaking to his colleagues.'

Whatever strength the German case in regard to the Duchy of Schleswig possessed, lay not so much in any appeal to history and law, as in the broad fact that in process of time the German population had pushed beyond the Eyder, and not only formed the majority in the Southern portion of the Duchy, but was even gradually obtaining a predominant voice in the towns of North Schleswig, where they represented the most active element in commerce. The Danes, on the other hand, realised that it was difficult for Denmark to exist as an independent Power without

Schleswig, because Schleswig was the key to the Danish islands ; and misled by the recollection of their easy triumphs in 1849 at Fredericia and Idstedt over the hastily collected levies commanded by Willisen, they believed that they might contend on not unequal terms with the armies of Prussia and Austria, forgetting that the Prussian army in 1848 had found no difficulty in overrunning Schleswig and Jutland, as they were now about to do a second time. The Danish Cabinet accordingly still preserved an unyielding attitude, relying on some repetition of the circumstances which had saved them before.

Lord Palmerston's Cabinet was greatly strengthened at this juncture by the return to office of Lord Clarendon. The Duke of Newcastle had resigned, owing to an illness which soon afterwards proved fatal, and a rearrangement of political offices followed. The Duke was succeeded by Mr. Cardwell ; and the Chancellorship of the Duchy, which had been held by Mr. Cardwell, became vacant. Lord Clarendon was persuaded by Lord Granville to accept it.

LORD CLARENDON TO LORD GRANVILLE.

THE GROVE, *March* 24, 1864.

'MY DEAR GRANVILLE,—Many thanks for your kind letter. I received others yesterday in the same friendly spirit from J. Russell, C. Grey, and C. Wood, and I sent my acceptance to Palmerston.

'As you know how genuine my hatred of office is, you will understand how much it cost me to make the effort you recommend. If the Government had been prosperous and sailing before the wind, I could not have brought myself to say "yes ;" but seeing breakers ahead, I could not refuse an oar in the boat with old friends. I am convinced, however, that they are mistaken in thinking I shall do them any good. The generous public will think me very greedy for the sweets of office, and Palmerston very wicked for not bringing forward any of the latent talent that is always talked of, but never appears, as it is withering away under the scornful pride of the Whig aristocracy.

'I think it quite right that the Secretary of the Colonies should be in the House of Commons under present circumstances, but query whether Chich. plus Frank's most useful political hospitality is

not a stronger man, than Cardwell?[1] Unless Palmerston among his other eminent qualities possesses those of Rarey, I don't see how Peel and Lowe are to be tamed. 'Ever yours,

'CLARENDON.'

The entry of Lord Clarendon into the Cabinet at this critical moment—though without the seals of the Foreign Office—tended to restore the confidence which Lord Russell's despatches had tended to impair. To Lord Granville Lord Clarendon's reappearance on the stage of public affairs was especially welcome, because Lord Palmerston and Lord Russell were more than ever on the war path. The popularity of a bellicose policy had become day by day greater in London, owing partly to natural sympathy with a small Power attacked by two powerful neighbours, partly to the recent marriage of the heir to the throne with a Danish princess. In Lord Clarendon, Lord Granville believed he had secured a powerful coadjutor in the saner counsels which he constantly pressed on his chiefs, both inclined to be led by the excited passions of the capital, which in Lord Granville's opinion did not represent the true mind of the majority of the nation.

On May 1, without consulting any of his colleagues except Lord Russell, Lord Palmerston informed Count Apponyi that if an Austrian squadron on its way to the Baltic were to pass along the English coasts in order to join the Austrian and Prussian squadrons which the Danes had defeated in a naval action off Heligoland, he would regard it 'as an affront and insult to England,' and that he 'would not stand such a thing,' and rather than stand it he would resign office.[2] This language he in due course communicated to the Cabinet. It was claimed by the Prime Minister and the Foreign Secretary that the Cabinet had approved it, and Lord Russell was about to embody these sentiments in a despatch to Lord Bloomfield, her Majesty's Ambassador

[1] The allusion is to the salon of Mr. Chichester Fortescue and Frances, Countess Waldegrave. (See vol. ii. p. 124.)

[2] *Life of Lord John Russell*, ii. 392; *Life of Palmerston*, v. 249; *Parliamentary Debates*, clxxxiv. 1979.

at Vienna, when he received a letter from Lord Granville denying that anybody in the Cabinet besides Lord Russell had approved the language of Lord Palmerston, and that no decision had been taken to communicate it to Lord Bloomfield. An anxious inquiry had meanwhile arrived from the Queen as to what was intended, for Sir Clarence Paget, who represented the Admiralty in the House of Commons, had said amid tumultuous applause at a public banquet that the British fleet was in the Downs ready to go anywhere, and the wits of the town were asking whether Lord Russell was about to fulfil Sydney Smith's prophecy and assume the command at ten minutes notice.[1]

LORD GRANVILLE TO LORD RUSSELL.

HOUSE OF LORDS, *May* 6, 1864.

'MY DEAR LORD RUSSELL,—I am afraid that a discussion to-morrow upon the Queen's question may lead to a general row: bad for the health of the Cabinet in general and for Palmerston's Government; for George Grey's stomach and for my jaw in particular. There can be no objection to "a most confidential" despatch to Bloomfield informing him of Palmerston's private conversation with Apponyi. I am certain that the approbation of the Cabinet will be contested by more important members of the Cabinet than myself.

'There is a public question as to the expediency of calling again upon Austria to give an assurance which she has already refused. But that is a different matter from the first.

'Yours, G.'

LORD RUSSELL TO LORD GRANVILLE.

CHESHAM PLACE, *May* 6, 1864.

'MY DEAR GRANVILLE,—If I am wrong in thinking that the Cabinet approved the language of Lord Palmerston to Count Apponyi, I greatly regret it.

'But in that case it is necessary for the Cabinet to adopt some other policy, and it will be for Lord Palmerston to consider whether he can be responsible for that policy.

'It is necessary for me, who am the organ of the Government in regard to foreign affairs, to ascertain what that policy is.

[1] Second Letter to Archdeacon Singleton, *Works*, ed. 1869, p. 745.

'I was no party to the draft agreed upon by the Cabinet on Saturday, nor could I have signed a despatch in the terms of that draft. I was at liberty, therefore, to propose another draft, which I did. It is true that I wanted to omit all mention of the fleet, as it was thought such a mention would be offensive to Austria.

'But that omission was not to prevent my informing our own Ambassador at Vienna, in a despatch marked "most confidential," of the conversation of Lord Palmerston with Count Apponyi, which I conceived was sanctioned by the great majority of the Cabinet.

'I think that Lord Palmerston's communication must either be confirmed or disavowed by the Cabinet; and that if members of the Cabinet wish to keep for themselves perfect liberty of action to be free to act how and when they like, but to avoid committing themselves to any threat (?) of definite action, or rather to any definite action, particularly action of an isolated character, Lord Palmerston's language must be distinctly repudiated.

'Of course I shall not be a party to such repudiation. But in the event of the Austrian fleet going into the Baltic, the event must not find the Cabinet unprepared. They must make up their minds one way or the other. 'Yours truly,

'RUSSELL.'

GENERAL GREY TO LORD GRANVILLE.

OSBORNE, *May* 9, 1864.

'MY DEAR GRANVILLE,—The Queen desires me to return Lord Russell's letter. It strikes her Majesty as strange that Lord Russell should declare himself to have been no party to the draft agreed to at the Cabinet on Saturday, and still more so that, claiming a right in consequence to suggest a new draft, he should not only send one, adopting the very language to which the Cabinet had positively objected both on Saturday and Monday, but that he should ask to have her Majesty's assent communicated by telegraph, so that no time should be lost in sending it. For I need not tell you that the draft sent for her Majesty's approval embodying Lord Palmerston's conversation with Count Apponyi, and expressing the concurrence of the Cabinet in the language he had used, was *not* marked "most confidential" or even "confidential," and that part of the compromise her Majesty desired me to suggest to you was, that this character should be given to it.

'All this naturally increases the feeling of distrust with which Lord Russell has contrived to inspire her. But she is most anxious that you should keep matters as smooth as you can, and do your best to prevent a ministerial crisis, which on such a question, and

in the present excited state of the public mind, would be very serious.

'Her Majesty will insist, before she goes to Scotland, upon no important step being taken without having been fully and maturely considered by the Cabinet, before it is submitted for her Majesty's approval. And she relies upon the Cabinet, and particularly upon yourself, to ease her from being dragged unnecessarily into this miserable war.

'I go to town this evening. Should I find you at home to-morrow morning if I called between ten and eleven?

'Believe me, yours very truly,

'C. Grey.'

The Cabinet eventually decided not to endorse the menacing language of Lord Palmerston, and early in May the belligerents accepted an armistice, which on the 12th was signed. The attention of the world was then diverted from the theatre of war in the Duchies to the room in the Foreign Office where the fate of Denmark was being discussed. The Queen by this time was not only alarmed by the ideas of her two principal ministers, but was also deeply moved by the conduct of the Opposition in the House of Lords. Lord Ellenborough, just as he had not been able to resist the temptation of taking advantage of the popular outcry against Lord Canning in 1858, now made himself the parliamentary mouthpiece of the party in London which, eager to plunge the country into war on behalf of Denmark, was attacking the Queen; for the main facts of the situation, including the views of the Queen, had got known. Lord Russell replied in the House of Lords with great force and dignity to these insinuations and attacks, and Lord Granville, as leader of the House, conveyed to the Queen what had passed.

General Grey to Lord Granville.

May 28, 1864.

'My dear Granville,—The Queen desires me to thank you very much for your letter. It naturally filled her with indignation to hear of such base and malignant attacks being *insinuated* against her by Lord Ellenborough, and under the impulse of the moment she wrote to Lord Russell to express her gratitude to him, and to give

vent to her feelings. I inclose the note with which she accompanied her letter in sending it down to me to be copied. She wishes you to ask Lord Russell to show it to you. It is certainly as she says somewhat incoherent, but it gives the more forcible expression to her feelings, and you will not I think be surprised at her feeling it deeply.

'She is also a good deal hurt that Lord Derby, who is the head of the party to which Lord Ellenborough belongs, and who must know from his own experience how utterly unfounded such accusations are, should not have said a word in contradiction or condemnation of Lord Ellenborough. If Lord Ellenborough had merely meant to state what was said in foreign papers, there was no occasion to allude to George III.'s well-known declaration, which was of no importance except by way of contrast.[1] But Lord Ellenborough must have *meant* to do mischief, and to take advantage of the dissatisfaction which doubtless exists at the Queen's continued seclusion, to make charges which, though he *must* know them himself to be utterly groundless, are precisely those which our *gobe-mouches* public swallows most greedily.

'The Queen hopes that somehow or other Lord Ellenborough may hear what she thinks of him.

'Believe me, ever yours truly,

'C. GREY.'

BALMORAL, *June* 1, 1864.

'MY DEAR GRANVILLE,—I think I have never seen the Queen so completely upset as she has been these last few days, during which she has, for the first time, been made fully aware of all the attacks directed against her on the subject of her supposed German predilections.

'First came Lord Ellenborough's insinuations; and he had had experience enough of the Queen during his tenure of office as a Cabinet Minister to know how completely alien from her character was conduct such as he ventured, by insinuation, to charge her with. Then came a letter from the King of the Belgians lamenting the bitter feeling that was rising against the Queen, and quoting Beust's supposed conversation with Louis Napoleon;[2] and lastly, and worst of all, a letter from Lord Russell, in answer to the Queen's natural and cordial expression of her heartfelt thanks for defending her

[1] The allusion is to the Royal Speech of George III. in opening his first Parliament, to which he is said to have added with his own hand the paragraph beginning, 'Born and educated in this country, I glory in the name of Briton.'

[2] Count Beust had been appointed to represent the German Confederation at the London Conference. He saw the Emperor Napoleon in Paris, and was supposed to have alluded to the views of the Queen as entirely German.

against Lord Ellenborough—written in his *coldest, hardest* style—in which he assumes not only that members of the Queen's family may have been imprudent in their language, but that the Queen herself may have used unguarded expressions, which, being misrepresented and misunderstood, may have given occasion to the attacks that are now, so unjustly, directed against her.

'The consciousness that these attacks are undeserved, at the same time that it gives the Queen confidence that the time will come when justice will be done, makes her feel them more intensely at the moment. She says, I believe most truly, that she doubts whether any one of her subjects, placed in a similar position, with all the ties of birth, relationship, and education enlisting their sympathies on one side, would divest themselves so completely as she has done of all thought of those natural ties, and give themselves up to the one thought of what was for the interest of England. She *cannot* believe that any members of her own family should have misrepresented, or given without intending it, occasion to the misrepresentation of her words and actions. There is not a line she has written to them that she would not wish laid before the world, certain that even the most malignant of her calumniators could not find a word to find fault with. She has done violence to her feelings to uphold the obligations of the Treaty of 1852, and has almost quarrelled with the Crown Princess, by deprecating the violent counsels Prussia seemed disposed to pursue, and by pointing out the strong feeling against her that had been created in England. She has taken up the defence of her Government both to the Duke of Coburg and the Crown Princess, and has protested in the strongest way against the distinction that has been attempted to be established between herself and her Ministers. And can you wonder that, feeling all this, and knowing how *honestly* she has acted with her Government, she should be deeply hurt by a cold dry letter from Lord Russell, quietly assuming that she may, inadvertently, have given occasion to the attacks which are made against her?

'As for her conversation with M. de Beust—you were at Osborne at the time—the Queen told you everything she had said, as she also reported it to Lord Russell. And she has been under the impression that, in saying to M. de Beust what she did, she was obeying the wishes of the Government. Count Vitzthum has written to me to say that M. de Beust entirely denied the account given of his interview with the Emperor, and to offer to contradict the statement. I have answered, by the Queen's direction, that the Queen not having seen the account alluded to, it was for M. de Beust to consider how far a contradiction was called for; that the Queen could

not believe M. de Beust would repeat in an improper manner anything that passed in a private audience, and that, were it otherwise, her Majesty was quite sure she had written nothing which, if correctly reported, would not bear publicity.

'The Queen wished me to write to you by this night's mail, and I am come up from dinner to do so. She was *immensely* pleased with your letter to me, and feels that she has in you a friend who will always stand up for her. But I should vainly attempt to describe to you how much she felt Lord Russell's letter, when, in answer to that she had written to him, she expected some words of support and comfort, and received instead nothing but the cold unfeeling insinuation that she may have given occasion to what has been said!

'Believe me, ever yours truly,

'C. GREY.'

THE QUEEN TO LORD GRANVILLE.

BALMORAL, *June* 5, 1864.

'The Queen cannot send Lord Russell the inclosed extract from a letter she received from her brother yesterday, but she sends it to Lord Granville, for he will best know whether there is not a good deal of truth in it.[1] That Germany felt and feels confidence in the Queen's impartiality and her determination to prevent any of those dangerous steps which Lord Palmerston and Lord Russell would on several occasions have plunged us into, there can be no doubt of. But the Queen and her *Cabinet* were always agreed. That this confidence in her abroad should exist, the Queen cannot be sorry for, and the foolish people (not the nation, for the Queen believes they never have doubted her) ought to be most proud of and thankful for it. In short, what the Duke of Coburg says, Lord Granville has told the Queen himself. She can't help suspecting Lord Palmerston and those about him, and even perhaps Lord Russell, when those repeated checks take place.

'The Queen sends Lord Granville her answer to her brother. In this tone she has ever written, never giving expression to her personal feelings and opinions, but always preaching moderation, and expressing a determination to do all in her power to restore peace and to promote a settlement satisfactory to all parties. The three points which the Queen invariably kept to were: (1) not to let this country be dragged into a useless war; (2) not to agree to a settlement which could not be durable; and (3) not to let a sovereign be imposed upon the Duchies against their will and wish. This the Queen, however, never wrote about, though she openly discussed it here to

[1] The Duke of Coburg is referred to.

her Ministers ; but she never mentioned this to M. de Beust, who seems to have misrepresented what she said. Lord Granville knows all that passed with him. He may mention the contents of her letter, and of the Duke's and her answer, to any of his colleagues (excepting Lord Palmerston and Lord Russell) whom he thinks it useful to communicate them to. She begs to have the inclosures back. . . .

'Oh, how fearful it is to be suspected—uncheered—unguided and unadvised—and how alone the poor Queen feels ! Her friends must defend her.'

All the diplomatic attempts made at the Conference by the English plenipotentiaries, Lord Russell and Lord Clarendon, to save Denmark from losing the whole of the Duchies, were foiled by the obstinate refusal of Bishop Monrad, the Danish Prime Minister, to make the only concessions which could have saved the situation ; for he unfortunately relied on the strength of public opinion in England and France being still sufficiently strong to force an armed intervention on their Governments. 'Germany would not stir an inch further ; Denmark stuck to the banks of the Schlei.' [1] In these words Lord Russell summed up the situation. Like the Emperor of the French when placed between the King of Sardinia and the Pope in 1860, Lord Russell did not know which was the more difficult to deal with : the resistance of the strong or of the weak, of Germany or Denmark. Each proved equally intractable, and a deadlock resulted.

THE QUEEN TO LORD GRANVILLE.

WINDSOR CASTLE, *June* 12, 1864.

'The Queen is much annoyed at hearing nothing from Lord Russell as to the result of the meeting with the Danish plenipotentiaries and of the Cabinet yesterday. What passed at the Cabinet yesterday? As we know, France and also Russia will not go with us in the employment of force. What is to happen if the Conference breaks up? We can't go to actual war alone with Germany to protect Denmark now, when the only subject of dispute is the comparatively small difference of boundary. What does the Government think it could do? And supposing it wished to protect Denmark, how is this to be done? If there is to be war, what sort of warfare is contemplated?

[1] Walpole, *Life of Lord John Russell*, ii. 304.

'Germany only wishes to obtain the Duchies, or at least Holstein and the German part of Schleswig. About Holstein there is no doubt, but only about a portion of Schleswig. What then can England fight about? Surely every possible means to avoid a recurrence of hostilities ought to be resorted to before this result is permitted to take place. Has the Cabinet well weighed all the possible contingencies?

'The Queen hears that the Opposition mean to make a great attack on the Government. It would be very unwise and impolitic; but suppose this to be the case, and the Government to be beat, would it not be a case for a dissolution? This is Lord Derby's House of Commons, and next year there would certainly have to be a dissolution.[1]

'The Queen's nerves and health would certainly suffer very severely from the shock of any crisis, especially from that of a change of Government, and she thinks Lord Palmerston ought hardly to resign without resorting to a dissolution.

'Alone and unaided . . . she writes to Lord Granville as a faithful friend and not as a minister, to hear from him his opinion as well as that of the Cabinet generally.'

Mr. Gladstone at this moment fortunately threw his influence on the side of reasonable counsels, and intervened with effect.

'The Queen [so her Majesty wrote to Lord Granville on June 16 from Windsor] has had a long and satisfactory answer from Mr. Gladstone about yesterday's Cabinet, and the very united and pacific tone of it—nothing could be better than his tone. The Queen hopes to hear from Lord Granville about to-morrow's Cabinet. She can't help thinking that it will have to end with the French proposal of ascertaining by vote the people's feelings, and she very much fears (for the Danes) that the result will be the loss of the whole of Schleswig, which Lord Russell only the other day told the Queen he thought the Danes might be just as well without!'[2]

The Danes, however, declined to accept the French suggestion, just as they had refused the more concrete proposals of Lord Russell and Lord Clarendon to define a new boundary. Before, however, the plenipotentiaries separated, serious differences had again arisen in the Cabinet. Lord Russell, in a final attempt to bring the

[1] It was Lord Derby who had dissolved the Parliament of 1858.

[2] The Queen to Lord Granville, June 16, 1864.

belligerents to agree to terms between themselves, wished to introduce a renewal of the main principle of the Treaty of London of 1852 into his proposals, so that, under given circumstances, the integrity of the Danish Kingdom, though within very diminished limits, would be again guaranteed by the Powers, including Great Britain. The danger of such a proposal was that, if refused by Austria and Prussia, it placed the country in the position of having to choose between war and another diplomatic humiliation. Lord Russell claimed that, at a meeting held on June 19, the Cabinet had agreed to the proposal, and he so informed the Danish plenipotentiary the same day. The accuracy of his recollection was, however, impugned by Lord Granville, and he disputed the wisdom of the idea. Another irritating correspondence was the result, and Lord Russell had eventually again to give way.[1]

The Conference terminated its sittings on June 25. The succeeding days were to show whether the calculations of Bishop Monrad were to be correct or not. What the consequences might have been had the Emperor of the French been willing to join in the struggle, it is difficult to judge. A Cabinet crisis would probably have resulted. But it soon became clear that the Emperor of the French, if he intervened, would do so only in order to compass far larger ulterior objects than the retention by Denmark of 50,000 population more or less near Hadersleben and Apenraade. Already in April he had told Lord Clarendon, who had gone over to Paris expressly to confer with him, that he would not expose himself again to what he called *un gros soufflet* by any language which he was not prepared to follow up. 'The liberation of Venetia would be the first object, something on the Rhine perhaps the second;'[2] in other words, a European convulsion of the first magnitude was now explained to be the condition of French intervention. He was not willing to join in any intervention merely to save Denmark from dis-

[1] Lord Granville to Lord Russell, June 19, 1864.

[2] Lord Cowley to Lord Russell, June 24, 1864; quoted in the *Life of Lord John Russell*, ii. 395.

memberment. No assistance was to be looked for from Russia, and in the event of war Great Britain would therefore have stood alone. The Queen urged that public opinion in England would never tolerate an alliance with France on the French terms, certain as it was to end if successful in a large transfer of German territory to France. Lord Russell could not deny the force of this argument. A great debate in both Houses of Parliament was impending, on which the fate of the Government depended, and a decisive resolution had therefore to be taken quickly whether the British Government intended to intervene actively, with or without allies. The decision was in the negative, but is said not to have been unanimous.

THE QUEEN TO LORD GRANVILLE.

WINDSOR CASTLE, *June* 23, 1864, 11.30 P.M.

'The Queen saw Lord Granville's letter to General Grey, which reassured her much.

'The Queen got a sensible and satisfactory answer to her letter from Lord Russell; Lord Palmerston merely answering that both parties were equally unreasonable, but gave no opinion—which surprised her—and the Cabinet would have to decide, he said.

'Lord Granville knows what the Queen has written—Lord Russell is to read her letter. What the Queen is so anxious for is that the true, real, and great interests of the country should be considered, and the enormous danger of allying ourselves with France, who would drag us into a war in Italy and on the Rhine and set all Europe in a blaze; which is so far more important than the very foolish excitement which the Queen is sure will cool down the moment war seems likely to result from it.

'Unreasonable though the Germans may be and are, the Danes are far more so; and by Lord Russell's own proposal their refusal absolves us from giving them any material aid. The fleet going to Copenhagen is a danger, and ought to be avoided. To keep the Austrian fleet away ought to be tried unofficially. If the Danes really believed and knew we should not help them, they would soon give up.

'The Treaty of 1852 must be given up. Its maintenance would enrage Germany uselessly. Could not something still be tried by the King of the Belgians?

'The Queen is completely exhausted by the anxiety and suspense, and misses her beloved husband's help, advice, support, and love in

an overwhelming manner. . . . A few days more of this hard work and terrible unsupported and unshared anxiety will quite prostrate her strength. Her Ministers should know how heavy her responsibility is, and should lighten it by pursuing a prudent course, and one which she feels is really for the country's interests—as much as any human aid can!

'She fears she has written quite illegibly, but she is so tired and unwell she can hardly hold up her head or hold her pen.

'She trusts to Lord Granville's doing all he can to prevent momentary difficulty and excitement being allowed to outweigh the real momentous interests which are at stake. If we take any hasty and imprudent step, it may ruin us!'

GENERAL GREY TO LORD GRANVILLE.

WINDSOR CASTLE, *June* 23, 1864.

'MY DEAR LORD GRANVILLE,—The Queen wishes me to write you a line to-night to say that she entirely agrees with you as to the inexpediency of endeavouring again to set up the Treaty of 1852. It is certain that this having been once set aside, with the consent of all the plenipotentiaries in conference, Austria and Prussia will never accept it again, and instead of raising questions which you know can only lead to difficulties, the object should be to try to find possible points of agreement.

'Lord Russell writes to the Queen that it will be very difficult to avoid giving assistance to Denmark; yet he admits that without France our aid will be inefficient! He hesitates with reason at the price asked by France for her co-operation, and says this will be one of the points, one of the most difficult too, which you will have to consider in Cabinet to-morrow. I hope Lord Russell will be very frank and explicit on Monday. If he takes the initiative in admitting possible errors of judgment, depend upon it, the country will admit the plea: *that his object was to keep the country out of war*; and that in offering disinterested advice in a case where no interests of this country were at stake, he could not accept it as any humiliation to this country that his proposals had been rejected—not always in the most courteous style. 'Ever yours truly,

'C. GREY.'

WINDSOR CASTLE, *June* 23, 1864.

'MY DEAR GRANVILLE,—The Queen wishes me to send you, confidentially, the copy of a letter she wrote last night to Lord Palmerston, and which she sent to me the first thing this morning to copy, that it might go by an early train. She wrote also a hasty

note to Lord Clarendon yesterday evening on the receipt of his letter announcing the expected final sitting of the Conference next Saturday. Her letter to Lord Palmerston may probably be shown to the Cabinet, as her Majesty refers Lord Russell to it in a letter she is now sending up, and which she has desired may be submitted to you. Her Majesty hopes you may also have Lord Cowley's letters of the 20th and 21st before you, which will show the whole gravity of the position.

'The Queen cannot see more in Drouyn's conversations with Lord Cowley, than a renewed attempt to get us entangled in the Danish war; and she sincerely hopes that we shall take the opportunity offered by the obstinacy of Denmark to withdraw altogether from further interference in the matter, should she persist in a course which must, of necessity, entail the resumption of hostilities.

'Her Majesty thinks the offer of the German Powers to accept "good offices" need not have been so summarily rejected. Good offices may easily grow into arbitration. On the other hand, the positive refusal by Denmark either of mediation or arbitration leaves no hope whatever of a pacific arrangement.

'Denmark in rejecting this proposal naturally wishes to fix us to the line of frontier at first proposed by us. But the negotiations which have subsequently taken place, with the idle view of finding a line more acceptable to Germany, and the arbitration we have proposed with the same view, imply that we admit the reasonableness of the German objections to the line first proposed; and the refusal of Denmark to accept any reference to a third Power throws the blame of the rupture of negotiations entirely on her.

'The Queen is sure if all these circumstances are fairly and openly stated, that the Government would be supported by the country in declining to involve it in war. 'Ever yours,

'C. GREY.'

WINDSOR CASTLE, *June* 27, 1864.

'The Queen has naturally learnt with deep concern, that the hopes that arbitration on the proposal of the French to take by vote the opinion of the mixed population would be accepted, have been frustrated by the total refusal of *everything* by the Danes. Lord Palmerston entirely agreed with the Queen yesterday, that no stone should be left unturned to try and prevent the resumption of hostilities. And therefore *mediation*, the Queen thinks, might still be tried, as the German Powers would *all* agree to that. But what can be done if Denmark, insanely and incredibly, refuses every proposal but the one line which we know the other parties never could

be brought to agree to ; and which the King of the Belgians wrote to the Queen the other day, it was *utterly impossible* the Germans could accept, with any chance of security for the future?

'Lord Russell's proposal, which was not yet sanctioned by the Government, was to give material aid (merely by sea) to Denmark *if* she *accepted arbitration* ; but she has absolutely refused that, as well as *mediation* and the last French proposal! All chance of bringing *her* to reason seems therefore hopeless ; and the Queen cannot but think that this country would do best were she to declare that after repeated efforts of one kind or another—which were first refused by one side, and then by the other—she has no other course but to withdraw, and to refuse to take any further part in this lamentable contest.

'The French are evidently most anxious (from Lord Cowley's letters) to get *us* into the quarrel, and to set all Europe in a blaze, by raising Italy, and by getting the Rhine. All this points to *our* keeping out of it altogether.

'The Queen concludes the Cabinet will meet to-morrow, and perhaps they may hit upon some further pacific measure ; but she owns she fears the total refusal of the Danes, which puts them entirely in the wrong, seems to preclude all hope of this.'

Denmark was now left to her fate, and in the settlement which followed was deprived by the Treaty of Prague not only of Lauenburg, Holstein and the southern or German portion of Schleswig, but also of the northern or Danish portion of that Duchy, which with ordinary prudence on the part of her plenipotentiaries at the London Conference she might have saved.[1] History now repeated itself. When Frederick the Great invaded Silesia, he was reported to have said : 'First I annex ; afterwards I shall have no difficulty in finding pedants to prove my title.'[2] The claims of the Duke of Augustenburg to the Elbe Duchies, which German opinion had endorsed and the Queen had expected would be recognised, were now roughly thrown aside by the conquerors ; and the original title of Denmark being assumed to have been good, the Duchies were declared to have passed, by right of conquest, to Austria and Prussia, which were now

[1] 'No nation has sought its own ruin so directly and resolutely as Denmark.' Vitzthum's *Memoirs*, ii. 375.

[2] Guilland, *L'Allemagne Nouvelle et ses Historiens*, p. 209.

entitled, according to the views of the Prussian Crown lawyers, to divide the spoils.

'Her Majesty thinks [General Grey wrote to Lord Granville] that it is quite right that we should not now mix ourselves up in the question, and that Prussia should at least be made aware of what she and her Government, and every honest man in Europe, must think of the gross and unblushing violation of every assurance and pledge that she had given, which Prussia has been guilty of.'[1]

With unavoidable pain, the Queen—and not the Queen only—had to realise that German unity was being brought about, not by the enlightened policy for which the Prince Consort had for so many years laboured, but by the policy of blood and iron. Few, however, will sympathise with the Duke of Augustenburg. It was known that after 1849 the reigning Duke had abandoned whatever claims—and they were far from clear—he may ever himself have had to the succession of the Duchies, but it was not generally known at the time, though the facts were open to the public, that he had also abandoned them on behalf of his successors as well, and thereby obtained an increase of the compensation awarded him. Prince Bismarck was well aware of it; because, when Prussian Minister to the Diet at Frankfurt, he had himself acted as the honest broker of the transaction, which he was now not disposed to forget.[2] But the historian, while refusing unnecessary sympathy to the Duke, and if also unable to deny that Denmark was largely responsible for her own disasters, will endorse the verdict of the public opinion of Europe, that the German intervention in Denmark, in a quarrel on the whole just in origin, was disfigured, from the moment that Prussia entered the lists, by a course of almost unexampled cynicism, and ended in a settlement in which successful force ran riot. The conditions of peace in regard to the new frontier were harsh and unjust, unnecessary to the security of Germany, and the brutal expression of the arrogance of victory and of the lust of conquest. Prince

[1] General Grey to Lord Granville, August 25, 1864.

[2] *Correspondence relating to Denmark*, 1850–53, pp. 101, 102, 107. The sum eventually fixed was 1,500,000 double rix dollars.

Bismarck could at least feel that there was no risk of anyone reproaching him, as M. Villemain had reproached the French Emperor in regard to his Italian policy in 1860, with having adopted *le terme moyen dans la violence.*[1]

But amid the personal sorrow and the political disappointment caused by these events, the Queen was at least able to remember with pride that owing to the determined stand which she had made against her two principal ministers she had saved the country from an unnecessary war. In this stand Lord Granville was her mainstay in the Cabinet. On him the Queen relied, and, as this narrative will have shown she did not rely in vain.

[1] De la Gorce, *Histoire du Second Empire*, iii. 185.

CHAPTER XVII

THE DEATH OF LORD PALMERSTON

1865

Agnosco stylum ecclesiæ is said to have been the observation of Fra Paolo Sarpi when he felt the dagger of the assassin in his neck. Such might have been the thought of Mr. Lowe also when he succumbed to the attack of the Church party in the House of Commons. Another and even more illustrious victim was now about to follow him, a sacrifice to the same animosities.

Nobody had joined Lord Granville in urging Mr. Lowe to await the decision of the Committee of the House of Commons before resigning, more strongly or eagerly than Lord Westbury, who had become Lord Chancellor; for on June 23, 1861, Lord Campbell had died, full of years and honours; and, as Lord Granville had foreseen, the Great Seal passed into the hands of Sir Richard Bethell, then Attorney-General. During the brief interval which elapsed before the delivery of the Seal to the new Chancellor, Lord Granville as Lord President acted as Lord Keeper.

'I congratulate your Lordship [Sir Richard Bethell wrote to him] that in addition to so many distinctions and honours, you have added that of having been "Keeper of the Great Seal," and for a time "Head of the Law" in Great Britain.

'Please to note it for your biographer.

'Whilst her Majesty retains the Great Seal, all bills in Chancery and petitions will be addressed to herself personally, and as this has never to my knowledge happened before, I will have a collection made of them, in case her Majesty shall be at all interested in knowing the cases in which she will personally, as an Eastern monarch, and not vicariously, administer justice. Will you kindly

try to impart to me a little of your exquisite tact in guiding and managing the House of Lords, and kindly cover and excuse any blunder or *gaucherie* which I may commit in entering on my new career?' [1]

Unfortunately, as Lord Westbury's biographer himself acknowledges, the new Chancellor had not been long in the Upper House before he had added further fuel to the fierce fire of animosity which he had already lit elsewhere, and Lord Granville had frequently to employ his 'exquisite tact' in protecting the Chancellor, whom in other respects Lord Granville found the most useful of colleagues, from the consequences of the barbed wit with which he delighted to poke fun at former allies, and occasionally to expose the folly of the criticisms passed on his large and well-considered schemes of law reform, by some noble lord who had something 'which he was pleased to call his mind,' or who, if possessed of a knowledge of the law, possessed it in a degree far inferior to the Chancellor, and was quickly made painfully aware of the fact. 'Mr. Henry Alworth Merewether, you are getting disgustingly fat: you are as fat as a porpoise,' exclaimed Chancellor one day as he issued from the Highest Court of Appeal, and observed the learned counsel referred to passing out of one of the committee rooms of the House of Lords, as the Chancellor sailed down the passage in all his glory. 'In that case,' was the retort of the unabashed Queen's Counsel, accompanied, as he was careful to add in telling the story, *with a profound obeisance*, 'I am evidently the fit companion of the Great Seal.' 'A Daniel come to judgment,' said an admirer. 'No,' replied Lord Chelmsford, 'not a Dan, only a Bethell.' But it was not everybody who enjoyed the power of repartee and the ready courage which enabled Lord Chelmsford or Mr. Henry Merewether to pay the Chancellor back in his own coin, and feel that perhaps they had not got the worst of it. So peers and bishops bided their time, while slowly but surely the enemies of Lord Westbury in the House of Lords joined the old antagonists of Sir Richard Bethell in the House of Commons, and banded themselves

[1] Sir Richard Bethell to Lord Granville, June 30, 1861.

together in a holy alliance with his numerous enemies at the Bar, who with varied motives, some personal and some professional, were united in the common hope of some day revenging their ancient and long accumulated griefs on the head of the Chancellor. These feelings were especially strong in the minds of the Bench of Bishops, who detested and dreaded the man whose judgments in ecclesiastical cases, redolent of an irony suggestive of Gibbon's page, were described by a witty solicitor as 'having dismissed Hell with costs, and deprived the orthodox members of the Church of England of their last hope of eternal damnation.'[1]

Thus it happened that when the Chancellor had been in office but little more than three years, he had to find himself one day, like Mr. Lowe, in private consultation with Lord Granville, as to whether or not a motion of the House of Commons, aimed at himself and mixed up with the question of the view to be taken of the report of a Committee, was fatal to the further tenure by him of his high office. The exact circumstances and the charges connected with the Edmunds case, and the appointment made by Lord Westbury to the Leeds Bankruptcy Court, need not detain the reader. In themselves they amounted at most to a charge of indiscretion arising out of a matter in which, as Sir Roundell Palmer pointed out in debate, 'Lord Westbury had at least the immense merit of having gone out of his way to expose and grapple with a scandalous robbery of public funds.' The real reason of the embittered attack on the Chancellor must be sought in the circumstances mentioned above. 'It all realises,' he told Lord Granville a few days before his fall, 'what was said last session by a certain prelate: that he would do anything to get me out of the Ministry.'[2]

It was difficult under this tempest to obtain even a fair and impartial hearing. Lord Derby, for example, after disclaiming as most improper any intention of prejudging the

[1] The whole of this mock epitaph, written by Sir Philip Rose, is given in the *Life of Lord Westbury*, ii. 78.

[2] Lord Westbury to Lord Granville, March 27, 1865.

case, immediately proceeded to discuss the Edmunds question upon the motion made in the House of Lords in March 1865 to appoint a Committee of inquiry.

'I venture [said Lord Granville] to suggest to your Lordships to follow the precept and not the example of the noble Earl opposite. The Lord Chancellor has made a personal statement which the noble Earl acknowledges he was justified in making. I listened to him most carefully, and I appeal to your Lordships, who are not interested in the matter one way or the other, whether he did not studiously abstain from making any attack. Feeling that it is the sense of the House that this Committee should sit, I agree entirely with the noble Earl that the discussion on this subject is premature, and must be unsatisfactory ; and I therefore suggest to your Lordships to follow the precept and not the example which the noble Earl set at the beginning of the debate.' [1]

This view, though with difficulty, prevailed, and a Committee was appointed. But the report by itself would never have necessitated the retirement of the Chancellor, had it not been followed by the circumstances connected with the resignation of the Registrar of the Leeds Bankruptcy Court, which not only coincided in point of time with the Edmunds case, but were complicated by a widely diffused report that pressure had actually been brought to bear on the Registrar by Lord Westbury to create a vacancy, intended to be filled by a near relative of his own. The existence of this suspicion was conveyed by Lord Granville to Lord Westbury in the following correspondence.

LORD GRANVILLE TO LORD WESTBURY.

16 BRUTON STREET, *March* 6, 1865.

'MY DEAR CHANCELLOR,—Lord Derby spoke to me this evening, and as I did not like him to look at us conversing on the woolsack about what he had said, I now write to you.

'He said that in the House of Commons a conversation had been held about Mr. Edmunds which would be renewed. He did not like, if he could help it, to mix himself up in questions of this sort, but he was informed on good authority that you intended to place your

[1] *The Debate on the Case of Mr. Edmunds as reported in the 'Times,'* London, 1865, published as a pamphlet.

eldest son in the place of the present Registrar of Bankruptcy at Leeds; and that he thought it fairer to the Government to tell them beforehand that such an appointment would not be tolerated. I answered that I knew nothing of this possible vacancy, or of any intention of yours as to the mode of filling it up; that one thing that made me incredulous as to rumours of this sort was, that I had already heard about your intentions many which were entirely without foundation—that I was, however, obliged to him for communicating with me on the subject, and I would mention what he had said to you.

'Yours sincerely,

'GRANVILLE.'

Lord Westbury replied in the following letters :—

HOUSE OF LORDS, *Tuesday.*

'MY DEAR LORD,—Many thanks for your note. Palmerston refers me to you and desires me to be guided by your judgment.

'As to what Lord Derby (very kindly I think) mentioned, I assure you that I positively refused to appoint my eldest son to any place, and that four days ago I offered the Registrarship to another gentleman. I shall be very glad of this occurrence to resign my office.

'Yours sincerely,

'WESTBURY.'

1 UPPER HYDE PARK GARDENS, *Tuesday evening.*

'MY DEAR LORD,—I send you the letter which I wrote as soon as I heard of the conduct of my eldest son. It was addressed to the Chief Registrar in Bankruptcy and immediately acted upon by my son's resignation. I obtained it from the Chief Registrar in consequence of the rumours to which Lord Derby referred. I am still more than ever convinced that it is expedient I should resign the Great Seal.

'Nothing can be more injurious than that the Lord Chancellor should be a person on whom attacks are (rightly or wrongly) made.

'I beg of you to see Lord Palmerston, and to come to that determination which the interests of the Ministry and the honour of the high office I hold appear to you to require.

'*Don't consider me personally in the least, but decide wholly on public grounds.*

'The letter I inclose was of course a private letter to the Chief Registrar; but it will prove the principles I have acted on with regard to the advancement of my sons. Make any use you please of it and of this note.

'Yours sincerely,

'WESTBURY.'

On July 3 the House of Commons, having received the report of a Committee which they had appointed on the matter of the Leeds Bankruptcy Court, carried a motion covering both this case and the 'Edmunds case.' The terms of this resolution, though absolving the Chancellor of any imputation in regard to the appointment to the Registrarship of the Leeds Court, nevertheless stated that there had been 'a laxity of practice and a want of caution' on his part in regard to it and to circumstances connected with Mr. Edmunds' case 'calculated to discredit the administration of his great office.' The Lord Chancellor immediately conveyed his determination to resign to Lord Granville in the following letter :—

LORD WESTBURY TO LORD GRANVILLE.

1 UPPER HYDE PARK GARDENS, *July* 4.

'MY DEAR LORD,—The end is worse than even *I* anticipated. It is certainly a sad thing that my public career should have this ignominious close.

'I am sorry that Lord Palmerston had not an opportunity of saying a few kind words, and particularly of stating publicly that it is *not* my attachment to office which has brought matters to this sad conclusion, for that I have repeatedly during the last five months entreated permission to resign.

'Pray prevail on him to state this.

'The nature of the Commission to the Chancellor renders it impossible for me to part with the Great Seal until Friday, but immediately on hearing from Palmerston I propose to write to the Queen to-day.

'With the kindest feelings of a grateful mind,

'Believe me, ever yours sincerely,

'WESTBURY.'

Lord Granville replied as follows the same day :—

'MY DEAR CHANCELLOR,—I will write to you as soon as I have seen Palmerston, but I cannot delay telling you how grieved and shocked I am. That there will be a reaction in public opinion from the violent vote of last night I do not doubt. I was in the House of Commons last night, and never saw anything less judicial. The Tory benches were crammed with M.P.s from all parts of the kingdom, and even from abroad. They met the Cabinet statements with howls and laughter. . . . Although our official connection may be

severed for a time, it will not affect our personal friendship, or the feeling of regard with which I am, 'Yours sincerely,

'GRANVILLE.'

The resignation of Lord Westbury and that of Mr. Lowe not only weakened the Government, but also liberated two men, one in each House, who, as the sequel was to show, were to prove dangerous critics of their former friends from the independent benches. Few Governments in the course of five years of office had suffered so severely by death and resignation as that of which Lord Palmerston was still the head at the end of 1865. Lord Campbell, who first received the Great Seal, had, as already seen, died in June 1861; Lord Westbury, his successor, now had to retire; Lord Herbert of Lea died in August 1862; Sir George Lewis followed in April 1863; the Duke of Newcastle in October 1864. Thus the three principal Secretaries of State who had respectively held the seals of the War, Home, and Colonial Departments when the Government was formed, had all passed away. To these losses had to be added those of Lord Canning and of his successor, Lord Elgin, whose active tenure of the Viceroyalty of India hardly exceeded a year. But if some of these losses came home more closely to Lord Granville than to most of his colleagues in the circle of personal friendship, none was more acutely felt by him politically in the House of Lords than the retirement of Lord Westbury. The substitution on the woolsack of the experienced and cautious Lord Cranworth, was no adequate compensation even in regard to legal questions for the loss of his brilliant, if rather dangerous, predecessor. Nor were the talents of Mr. Lowe adequately replaced even by the practical experience on educational questions of Mr. Bruce, who became Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education. As Lord Lyttelton had unceremoniously said, the Government was rickety, and depended on the life of the aged chief at the helm.

A great figure in the ranks of the Conservative party also disappeared at this time. Lord Lyndhurst had been Chancellor in the Government of the Duke of Wellington in 1828, and in both the Administrations of Sir Robert Peel.

Subsequently he had obtained an unrivalled position as the *vir pietate gravis* of the Upper House. He died on October 12, 1863. If his destructive criticisms hastened the downfall of both the Administrations of Lord Melbourne, there were also occasions—generally connected with questions of law reform—where his support, and his support alone, had enabled measures promoted by Liberal Governments to find their way on to the Statute Book. This was notably the case with the great measure of 1857 for the reform of the laws of marriage and divorce, which, as related in a previous chapter, was one of the first important Bills to which the assent of the House of Lords had to be obtained after Lord Granville had become leader.

'During Lord Lyndhurst's dignified and serene old age, made happy by you [Lord Granville wrote to Lady Lyndhurst], his kindness and friendship to me were without limit. I have often said with truth that, even in my political career, I never received more encouragement from any one of my own party than I did from your husband; and on several occasions with the knowledge of my chief I consulted him, and always received excellent advice. You are aware how often he admitted me to his house; and I need not remind you how charming was his conversation, so natural and cheerful, so pointed and yet entirely free from personal vanity. It often reminded me of that of Lord Melbourne—both apt to hit the nail on the head without regard for the commonplace and conventional view of the subject.' [1]

In July 1865 Parliament was dissolved. The general election—notwithstanding the want of success of Lord Russell's Polish and Danish campaigns—gave to Lord Palmerston a substantial majority. The majority was his own, and his popularity was greater than ever, both with the newly elected members and in the country at large. But in the inner circles of political life it was known that a great diminution of physical power had been observed in the aged Premier by those nearest to him, and that it was an open question whether he would ever meet Parliament again. All

[1] Lord Granville to Lady Lyndhurst, October 8, 1863, *Life of Lord Lyndhurst*, p. 505.

such speculations were ended by his death on October 18. As was inevitable, Lord Russell succeeded him, but it was immediately felt that a change greater than that of the substitution of one statesman for another as Prime Minister had taken place. The new Prime Minister, and Mr. Gladstone who had succeeded to the lead in the House of Commons, were, it was known, determined once more to take up the question of Parliamentary Reform. But the Liberal majority was very largely composed of members more in sympathy with the late than with the new Premier on that question, and it was doubtful whether a majority so constituted could hold together if any unexpected strain were placed on their allegiance. Lord Russell told the Queen that the Ministry 'to have a chance of stability must be either frankly Liberal or frankly Conservative,' and that he did not think that 'a mixed, colourless, characterless Ministry would have any chance of stability.'[1] But it was precisely such a Ministry that many of the recently elected members of the House of Commons were known to desire, and Lord Russell was therefore fully conscious of the uncertain character of the situation.

Immediately on being charged with the formation of a Government, Lord Russell offered the Foreign Office to Lord Clarendon, and so far greatly strengthened the Government. To Lord Granville, who was in France, he conveyed his feelings on the loss they had suffered in a letter which was quickly followed by one from the new Foreign Secretary, and in both the same apprehensions were developed.

LORD RUSSELL TO LORD GRANVILLE.

PEMBROKE LODGE, *October* 20, 1865.

'MY DEAR GRANVILLE,—After Palmerston's illness at the end of the session, his relapse, his weakness, and his eighty-one years on his shoulders, besides public cares, nothing could be more natural than that he should either die, or be forced by infirmity and public clamour to resign. And yet, as you say, his death was quite unexpected. I am convinced that for him the first of the two contingencies I have mentioned was the best, and that he has been as

[1] Walpole, *Life of Lord John Russell*, ii. 409.

in all the rest, *felix opportunitate mortis*. The country could not be more flourishing or more powerful. *For us the matter bears a different aspect.* I have written to you this morning, and should like to see you here on Wednesday next. I propose to summon a Cabinet for Thursday. 'Ever yours affectionately,

'RUSSELL.'

LORD CLARENDON TO LORD GRANVILLE.

THE GROVE, *October* 21, 1865.

'MY DEAR GRANVILLE,—I have your letter of the 19th, and should have written to you sooner if I had not thought that you had been telegraphed for to come over directly.

'This last illness might have been avoided and his life prolonged if he had listened to advice, or taken the commonest precautions against catching cold; but it must be owned that he has died at the best moment for himself, in the plenitude of his political and intellectual power, just after the triumph accorded to him by the country at the elections, without suffering or change of habits or loss of consciousness; and plucky and "Palmerston" to the last moment.

'He held a great bundle of sticks together. They are now unloosed, and there is nobody to tie them up again. What they will do by and for themselves is a doubtful question, and I fear confusion.

'The Queen, in anticipation of the event, wrote to John Russell that she should charge him with carrying on the Government. I got a letter from him yesterday morning asking me to lighten his labours by returning to the Foreign Office, and I have felt ever since as I do on board a steamer in a gale. I wrote to him that if he insisted I would accept. I believe he has written to all the colleagues to ask for their support. Gladstone, the moment he heard of Palmerston's death, went to John Russell to say that he would serve cordially &c. The others will probably do the same, and the object I suppose will be to make as little change as possible.

'I have reason to believe that the Manchester School and the reform agitators will be quite satisfied with Johnny chief and Gladstone leader, and I have no doubt they are quite right. What I much fear at this moment is such a report from the Cattle Commission as will make the meeting of Parliament necessary, which would be most unfortunate.[1] 'Ever yours, C.'

[1] The Commission reported in October and led to the legislation passed in the following year for stamping out the disease and enlarging the powers of the Privy Council. Of these Bills Lord Granville had charge in the House of Lords.

The death of Lord Palmerston made vacant the Lord Wardenship of the Cinque Ports. It was the first piece of official patronage of which Lord Russell had to dispose, and he offered it to Lord Granville. 'As you have no place on the sea,' he wrote, 'perhaps you would like to be Warden of the Cinque Ports. The salary is *nil*, and the expense something.'[1] So Lord Granville entered on the ancient office and thus became the occupier of Walmer Castle, unmoved by a caustic article in the *Saturday Review*, which saw in the appointment yet another instance of Whig nepotism and jobbery. As, however, many statesmen have lived happily for long years without having a place on the sea, it may be surmised that Lord Russell, when he wrote the above letter, was possibly nursing the illusion that the occupation of Walmer might terminate the schemes once and for all which it was well known occupied no small part of Lord Granville's leisure hours with an abortive search for a *pied à terre* in the country not far from London. This spot, like the imaginary castle in a romance, seemed somehow always to elude the grasp of the intending occupier, and to recede farther and farther into the distance. But if any such idea had entered Lord Russell's head, it must be confessed that, notwithstanding his age and experience, he had failed to probe the innermost recesses of his colleague's mind, for those schemes were too much in harmony with the tastes which Lord Canning termed his friend's 'experimental proclivities' to be lightly abandoned. The occupation of the property not far from Hampstead already mentioned in these pages, which the gods had called Golder's Hill but profane friends had baptised 'Pig's Marsh'—a nickname borrowed from a previous and not very fortunate venture of the same kind—had up to this time been a source of constant interest. The neighbourhood had once been celebrated by Akenside, who established himself there after 'a fit of illness' in 1758. 'How gladly 'mid the dews of dawn,' the poet had sung,

> 'My weary lungs thy healing gale—
> The balmy west or the fresh north—inhale.

[1] Lord Russell to Lord Granville, December 7, 1865

How gladly, while my musing footsteps rove
Round the cool orchard or the sunny lawn,
Awaked I stop, and look to find
What shrub perfumes the pleasant wind,
Or what wild songster charms the Dryads of the grove.' [1]

In the recesses of that quiet neighbourhood we get glimpses of the poet and his patron Dyson reciting Virgil and Cicero in their walks, amid the placid scenes around them, and rejoicing in their absence from the trouble and turmoil of the capital. But whatever may have been the case in regard to poets—and the memory of Wordsworth, it was asserted by the few defenders of the place, could be added to that of Akenside—Golder's Green was found an uncongenial spot by persons who had to study Blue Books and attend the House. Further, even if swine fever did not break out there, it is certain that cattle plague did, and when at this period of his official career the Lord President had to unfold to an audience of landed proprietors in the Upper House the first official scheme presented to Parliament for dealing with the contagious diseases of animals, he not only was speaking to an audience more than usually prepared to give him a sympathetic hearing, but was able to appear as a heavy personal fellow-sufferer in common with those whom he was addressing. In 1868 Golder's Green was therefore abandoned, like the original Pig's Marsh, amid the tacit rejoicing of unsympathetic friends, who preferred the sea views of Walmer to the chimneys of the ever encroaching town. Possibly another circumstance may have contributed to the result. On September 26, 1865, Castalia, the youngest daughter of Mr. Walter Frederick Campbell, of Islay in the county of Argyle, became the second Lady Granville; and thus there commenced a period of twenty-five years of married ties, which were not the least happy part of Lord Granville's life.

When Felix V. abandoned power—if the example of that Pontiff may once more be quoted—he found an agreeable retreat in the castle of Ripaille on the shores of Lake Leman,

[1] Book II. Ode xii. stanza vi., 'On Recovering from a Fit of Sickness in the Country, 1758.' As to Pig's Marsh, see above, p. 225.

and for a time it appeared as if the improvements in the gardens and grounds which Lord Granville carried out on the edge of the sea in Kent would prove a consolation for the loss of the leadership in the House of Lords, and the failure of his efforts as an improver of land near the metropolis. If, however, the full truth had to be spoken, a later annalist might have to record the history of certain transactions connected with further schemes of land acquisition in the southern counties, of which the delving of a pond in Surrey and the threat of a lawsuit in Hampshire were the principal results. It has been said that one who as a boy could dimly recollect riding along the Hendon road with the Lord President to view an eligible country estate—on a site now covered with houses—asserted that he lived to take part thirty years later in an expedition to view a sheltered chalk pit among the Surrey hills, which, screened from northern winds, Lord Granville had persuaded himself was indicated by Providence as the spot destined for the country house after which he had so long been seeking. At one moment also, under the advice of Sir James Lacaita, Lord Granville appears to have contemplated the purchase from Lord Westbury of a beautiful property not far from Florence, where stood an ilex grove unrivalled even in Tuscany.

At Walmer Lord Granville built new stables and kennels, for he kept a pack of harriers ; and by planting with the trees and shrubs most likely to withstand the severe climate, a marked change was rapidly made in the gardens and grounds. Under the advice of Mr. Devey, though archæologists protested, he transferred the old stones of Sandown Castle, which was rapidly crumbling into the sea, and with them erected a new tower ; and among other improvements he also purchased the land belonging to the old semaphore station, where he set up a building overhanging the sea, and named it after his daughter 'Villa Vita.' Thence the eye could range over the English Channel, and in winter might evoke out of the dim sea fogs the vision of the mournful spirits which Heine saw flit over the grey waters of the Northern deep, or in summer gaze at

'The stately ships go on
To their haven under the hill,'

in all the glory described in the immortal lines which go on to recall the vision of those who will not return either by sea or land—

'The touch of a vanished hand
And the sound of a voice that is still'—

lines which just at this moment of Lord Granville's life had a message of their own of peculiar sadness.

In June 1865 Lord Granville's favourite niece, the fourth daughter of Lord Rivers, had married Mr. Arbuthnot. They determined that their wedding trip should be in Switzerland. They had arrived at Interlaken, and set out on the morning of June 22 on horseback with an experienced guide to ascend the Schilthorn in the Bernese Alps. The weather was fine. About halfway up the mountain they alighted and continued the journey on foot. The sky became clouded, but the guide expressed no alarm. Mrs. Arbuthnot, feeling tired by the sultry heat, sat down to rest; while Mr. Arbuthnot and the guide proceeded a little farther on the ascent. In a few minutes a terrific thunderstorm burst over the mountain, and Mr. Arbuthnot and the guide at once returned with all possible speed to the spot where they had left Mrs. Arbuthnot. They found her dead. She had been struck by the lightning and killed instantaneously.[1]

On the morning when the news of this tragic occurrence arrived in England, Mr. Gladstone had expected Lord Granville to breakfast, but his place remained vacant. Very soon a note arrived. 'I have this moment heard that my poor darling niece, Alice Arbuthnot, has been killed by lightning;'[2] so it ran. The mysterious and terrible character of the announcement cast consternation among the assembled guests, most of whom had known the victim of the tragedy. The lament that everything beautiful must die,

[1] *Times*, June 23, 1865.
[2] Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone, June 23, 1865.

and that youth itself is not exempt from the common fate, has been uttered in every language and in every age. The best earthly consolation is when the names of the untimely dead become through their merits a treasured remembrance in the hearts of the survivors, and their virtues are sung by the lips of the living. Mr. Gladstone—not that such compensations were not abundantly present—sought to find comfort for his friend in the feelings which elevate consolation above the last echoes of any funeral march, and can discover it even within the mystery of unexplained visitations.

MR. GLADSTONE TO LORD GRANVILLE.

11 CARLTON HOUSE TERRACE, S.W., *June* 23, 1865.

'MY DEAR GRANVILLE,—I have not answered your sad note earlier. It seemed almost profane to do it amid the whirl of work around me. Yet I must write amidst that disturbance, rather than be silent. What a woe ! Youth, health, beauty, happiness and hope, all smitten to the earth and smitten in an instant ! But the lightning is only the minister of One stronger than the lightning; and we must not believe, because His dispensations are sometimes to our poor eyes so terrible, that the Almighty has ceased to be the same as ever, or that it is no longer deeply true that in all things "God is love."

'We could not comprehend the blank at our breakfast table until that note came in and filled us, I will not say with your feeling, but with some part of it, and with something not unlike it. For in that case, no one who had ever seen, could forget. Thus the mind travels round that sorrowing circle, so often visited. May the Almighty sustain abundantly according to their great need every one of you, on whom He has thus laid His hand.

'Believe me, very sincerely yours,

'W. E. GLADSTONE.'

The same events which led to Lord Granville becoming Lord Warden of the Cinque Ports also made him cease to be leader in the House of Lords, for Lord Russell, on succeeding Lord Palmerston, necessarily became Lord Warden of the Liberal benches in the Upper House.

'Personally I am rather sorry to lose the business of the House of Lords which gave me a position much beyond my merits [he wrote to Lord Clarendon]. I wrote to John Russell telling him that I

would cordially give him the little assistance in my power. I shall ask him, as I presume others will, not to make many *coups d'état* without consulting the Cabinet.'[1]

Lord Granville had led the House of Lords from February 1855 to October 1865, a period of upwards of ten years. It had been a task carried on in a trying political period, and under constantly increasing difficulties. To some this statement may appear exaggerated, for each successive generation is prone to imagine that it has been selected to deal with problems of unusual difficulty, and underrates the difficulties of the generation immediately preceding, whose achievements, already partially forgotten by the living, are not yet recorded by the historian, and remain for the time in a sort of political limbo, awaiting the final judgment:—

'betwixt two ages cast,
The first of this and hindmost of the last.'

It is therefore not extraordinary that an unfavourable contrast should be frequently drawn between the years just mentioned and those which followed from 1865 to 1885. The latter period was undoubtedly one of great political activity, and it is therefore sometimes supposed to follow as a necessary consequence that the earlier period must have been a time of ease and quiet, when a select party of *poco curante* statesmen and armchair politicians was able to enjoy a prosperous existence and leave the unsettled problems and vexed questions of the time to be dealt with by a more earnest and strenuous posterity. It is true that during the last three years of Lord Palmerston's reign in the House of Commons, the reforming activities of Parliament and the Cabinet were not conspicuous. But even in the sphere of home affairs the decade of 1855 to 1865 taken as a whole was no inactive time. It saw many of Mr. Gladstone's greatest financial triumphs; it witnessed the conflict between the two Houses of Parliament over the repeal of the Paper duties, the Divorce Act, and the constitutional struggle over the attempt to create Life Peerages;

[1] Lord Granville to Lord Clarendon, November 12, 1865.

it had to weather the Lancashire cotton famine and the commercial panic of 1852; it dealt successfully with the reform of the criminal law, and it submitted to the inquiries without which the educational legislation of subsequent years would have been impossible. But only a narrow view of affairs would confine an estimate of the activity of any political period to a valuation of the legislative produce of Parliament, which is generally found to be in inverse proportion to the importance of the foreign and colonial questions which occupy public attention. In order to form a correct estimate of the time, it should not be forgotten that over it the gloomy shadows of the Crimean War and of the Indian Mutiny hung, visibly seen and acutely felt, distracting public attention and exercising a paralysing influence over the activity of Parliament. Wars with Persia and China, and the commercial questions to which they gave rise, accompanied and followed the Mutiny. The Franco-Italian War and the Mexican expedition with their wide consequences also fell within this period. The results of the attempt to assassinate the Emperor of the French in 1858 not only stirred the Continent, but also caused a great upheaval in the domestic politics of Great Britain, brought about the fall of a powerful Ministry, and indirectly led to a permanent increase of military expenditure. The same period witnessed the Civil War in America, and narrowly escaped seeing Great Britain drawn into it; nor were the menacing problems in Central Europe, which found their ultimate solution in 1866, any the less a cause of anxiety and constant preoccupation to the statesmen of the time, because men still hoped to see them settled without an appeal to the sword. If the Eastern question seemed to slumber, it was not that it had ceased to exist, or was not liable at any moment to wake into dangerous activity, as wake it almost did over the union of the Danubian Principalities in 1861. If therefore no possibility existed of passing large measures for the enfranchisement of the people, the redistribution of seats, and popular education, and if Lord Granville, and even Lord Russell, abandoned the attempt, the main cause was to be sought not in the

imaginary existence of a time of calm and indifference, but in the difficulty which every Government, especially a Liberal Government, always experiences in dealing with domestic questions effectually, when foreign or colonial problems of a pressing character excite an overmastering interest on the public mind, and furnish a ready plea to the Opposition that matters should stand over till quieter times.

A period such as this brought quite as many troubles to the Liberal leader in the House of Lords as one of activity in domestic reform, for the House of Lords was a body as hostile to a Liberal policy abroad as to reforms at home. If a Liberal majority ever existed in that assembly, it has to be sought for in the remote days of Queen Anne and George I. The nearest approach to it in recent years was in the early part of the period now under consideration, which was still influenced by the effect of the Free Trade controversy. That controversy split the ranks of Lord Derby's followers asunder; and Lord Aberdeen in 1852 carried over with himself as leader a goodly retinue to join his former antagonists on the benches opposite. But the state of things thus produced was but temporary, and when Lord Granville succeeded Lord Aberdeen in the leadership in 1855, the process had already commenced which, slowly and steadily continuing from year to year, finally left the Liberal party in the Upper House in 1886 the mere shadow of its former self, with as much resemblance to a great organised political connection as the wreck of the French army at the end of 1812 bore to the Grand Army which earlier in the year had crossed the Niemen. The history of Lord Granville's leadership, of which the first period d just terminated, is the record of a long struggle to keep together on the red benches a party worthy of the name in point of numbers and reputation. *Nitor in adversum* was once said by Burke to be an appropriate motto for himself.[1] Lord Granville's qualities and accomplishments do not naturally suggest a comparison with those of Burke, but in regard to his position in Parliament he might have

[1] 'Letter to a Noble Lord,' *Works of Edmund Burke* (ed. 1866, Boston), v. 193.

claimed the motto. There was never a time when he was not justified in playfully alluding to the leader of those who faced him as 'the master of many legions,' or in saying of his own following, 'What are we among so many?' There never was a time when he did not have to realise the painful truth of the adage attributed to Lord Wellington in Spain, that a pitched battle is the last resort of a good general. That the disruption was not more rapid, and that the Liberal party so long survived the inner struggle which went on within it, as well as the attacks of open and avowed enemies, was mainly due to the skill with which he acted as the honest broker of divergent opinions, the interpreter of conflicting views and the discoverer of common ground. These qualities, if necessary in the period now closing, were not likely to be less so when the genial presence and popularity of Lord Palmerston were no longer among the political assets of the Liberal party.

CHAPTER XVIII

THE LEADERSHIP OF EARL RUSSELL

1865–1867

By the succession of Lord Russell to Lord Palmerston as Prime Minister, Lord Granville was relieved of the immediate duties of the leadership in the House of Lords, but his real responsibilities were but slightly diminished. Lord Russell was now in his seventy-second year. He had long been in the habit of relying very largely on Lord Granville's advice, and it was only a question of time how soon the latter would find himself again installed in the position which he had so long held, whenever the survivor of 'the two ancient masters,' who did not enjoy the robust health and vigour possessed by Lord Palmerston, chose to retire. Meanwhile the sphere of Lord Granville's influence was hardly, if at all, diminished. Thirteen years had elapsed since Lord Russell had been Prime Minister: nearly eleven since he had given up the leadership of the House of Commons. His retirement, as already seen, had been brought about partly by the disputes connected with the conduct of the Crimean War, partly by his fixed desire—shared in at the time by but few of his colleagues—to see the electoral franchise placed on a wider basis. Once more Prime Minister, he wished to seize the opportunity which presented itself, of not allowing his career to terminate without again identifying his name with the question upon which his earliest and greatest triumphs had been won; and this wish, coupled with the recent declarations of Mr. Gladstone in favour of the extension of the franchise, rendered it certain

in 1865 that the question of reform would again become the dividing line of parties. But the task of carrying a Reform Bill was peculiarly difficult. Among a large section of the members who had been the followers of Lord Palmerston, the strongest dislike existed of meddling with the franchise. At least one influential member of the Cabinet, Lord Clarendon, shared their views, though from loyalty to old friends, and owing to the comparative indifference with which he regarded home questions, he was certain not to express his opinions in public; and he consoled himself by the distribution of even a greater shower than usual of jokes pointed at the pugnacity of Lord Russell and the enthusiasm of Mr. Gladstone.

The immediate duty of the moment was to fill the vacancy in the Government caused by the death of Lord Palmerston. Lord Clarendon, as already seen, had taken Lord Russell's place at the Foreign Office; and the Duchy of Lancaster, which Lord Clarendon held, was consequently vacant. The names of Mr. Bouverie, Mr. Horsman, and Mr. Lowe were all suggested. All three belonged to the class of independent politicians, though they had at different times held office: all of them had enemies very largely of their own creation. Mr. Lowe had also expressed opinions strongly adverse to the extension of the franchise, but it was hoped he might be willing to compromise them.

Owing to the retirement from office, in consequence of a severe accident, of Sir Charles Wood, who will in future have to be spoken of as Lord Halifax, another vacancy was soon after created in the Cabinet. Lord Granville wished that an offer should be made to Mr. Lowe. Lord Russell was in favour of Mr. Stansfeld. The majority of the Cabinet were of opinion that an offer to Mr. Lowe would under the circumstances be idle. It was therefore decided to ask Lord Russell to see Mr. Lowe and exchange views with him, but not to offer him office unless Mr. Lowe were willing to modify his opinions. This wish was conveyed by Mr. Gladstone to Lord Russell.

MR. GLADSTONE TO LORD RUSSELL.

11 CARLTON HOUSE TERRACE, *December* 6, 1865.

'MY DEAR LORD RUSSELL,—I mentioned in the Cabinet to-day that you had expressed a willingness to see Lowe upon the statement I had made to you, but not to make any overture to him or to say anything which could be construed into an overture.

'There was some conversation on the subject, and the upshot was, I think, as follows :—

'Without attaching a very great importance to it, all appeared to be of opinion that there would be advantage in a friendly and courteous communication to him, conveying an acknowledgment of his parliamentary station and abilities, and of his services to the Government of Lord Palmerston while he was a member of it ; the desire that would have been felt to have him associated with you as a colleague, and the regret, on the other hand, which we all entertained at the fact that the strong opinion declared by him, in opposition to that of the Government, that there ought not to be any lowering of the suffrage in boroughs, interposed for the moment an insuperable obstacle.

'We were all ready to be quoted in the mass as entertaining these feelings of concern that circumstances were for the time so unpropitious, if you should think it desirable to refer to the sentiments of your colleagues. 'I remain, sincerely yours,

'W. E. GLADSTONE.'

Lord Russell shrunk from the task which the Cabinet wished to impose upon him.

'I wish you would undertake the job [he wrote to Lord Granville], and would express my regrets to Lowe, as you are in the habit of business with him, which I am not. If he supports us on Reform, there would be no better recruit. If he declares again that the people ought not to be represented in Parliament, we can have nothing to do with him. But he has very great abilities and very great knowledge.' [1]

Lord Granville accordingly saw Mr. Lowe, but all overtures proved ineffective, for Mr. Lowe would not compromise his opinions and the negotiation ended. While the claims of Mr. Bouverie and Mr. Horsman and also of Mr. Stansfeld were still being canvassed, Lord Russell took one of those sudden decisions by which he was wont occasionally

[1] Lord Russell to Lord Granville, December 17, 1865

to scare his colleagues. In this instance, however, the decision was a fortunate one, for, passing over all the three competitors, he invited Mr. Goschen to become Chancellor of the Duchy and a member of the Cabinet. Not even Mr. Gladstone, by whose side Mr. Goschen was to sit, was informed of the offer, nor does it appear that Lord Granville was in the secret. The decision had at least the advantage of being ratified by public opinion, and was certainly agreeable to Lord Granville, who not only admired Mr. Goschen but distrusted Mr. Horsman, while he still resented the part of the 'candid friend' which Mr. Bouverie had so often played in the House of Commons. Lord De Grey took the place of Sir Charles Wood at the India Office, and Lord Hartington that of Lord De Grey at the War Office, while Mr. Chichester Fortescue replaced Sir Robert Peel as Chief Secretary for Ireland, the latter disappearing from the Government.

The exclusion of Mr. Lowe spelt reform. On March 12, 1866, Mr. Gladstone introduced a Franchise Bill. Meanwhile, in the House of Lords, Lord Granville was 'baited with questions.' Lord Overstone said 'he ought to sit as a model for St. Sebastian with arrows sticking into all parts of his person.'[1] It soon became clear that in the House of Commons, as then existing, it was more than doubtful whether the second reading of the Bill could be carried. In the Government itself there were those who cried forward and those who cried back. The Bill, as the title showed, was only a Franchise Bill, and did not touch the question of redistribution of seats. Lord Russell, bearing in mind the precedent of 1832, considered that this had from the first been a tactical error, and wished Mr. Gladstone to take an early opportunity of announcing the immediate introduction of a Redistribution Bill during the debate on an amendment of which Lord Grosvenor had given notice for the second reading of the Franchise Bill. But several members of the Cabinet—and among them Lord Granville—objected that so important a change of front in the face of the enemy would be a blunder—whatever the wisdom of the original decision may

[1] Lord Granville to Lady Granville, February 24, 1866.

have been—and would only look like a surrender to the dissentient Liberals, who had at once seized the advantage which the mistake made by the Cabinet in separating the two measures had given them. Lord Russell complained that Lord Granville did not seem as sound on the Reform question as he had anticipated, and in reply to a letter from the Prime Minister in a complaining tone, Lord Granville justified himself as follows :—

WALMER, *March* 26, 1866.

'MY DEAR LORD RUSSELL,—Many thanks for having written to me. I have read your letter with the greatest interest. But one phrase makes me a little uneasy, from a fear that you think I require a stimulus in the matter of allegiance to my party. The only three things that I can think of as likely to give such an impression are: (1) my recommendation of Lowe for your forming the Government, (2) the secession of Lansdowne and Grosvenor, (3) the objection I raised at the last Cabinet but one, to our changing our tactics.

'I still think that if you had sent for Lowe during the first week, telling him you must have a Reform Bill, and putting to him whether it was possible to adopt a "finality" position, he would have accepted your terms. No one can doubt that out of the Government he has been of great assistance to our enemies, and has worked great mischief to the Government and to things still more important.

'As to Lansdowne and Grosvenor, nobody regrets more than I do their opposition to us on the question of Reform. The morning I heard of Grosvenor's intention, I wrote to Sutherland, who is quite staunch, and implored him to see what he could do, but that afternoon Grosvenor gave the notice.

'Lansdowne's only link now or in future with the Whig party is his strong personal attachment to many of us.

'My reason for objecting to a change of tactics was not an indifference to Reform, but the fear of placing the question and ourselves in a worse position. Gladstone's announcement seems already to have done good so far as the chances of a second reading, but I cannot doubt that the publication of our plan for the redistribution of seats will increase the number of the enemies to our Bill in the House of Commons.

'As to the question of Reform, I do not consider it as of the same importance as the same subject in 1831, or as Catholic Emancipation or as Free Trade; but I have always voted with you on all the proposed Bills including that of this year. It is true that Bright's fruit-

less attempts to excite the people on a matter for which I was anxious chiefly as a means of justice to the people, made me a little less zealous ; but my party spirit has been roused by the late violent opposition, and the injudicious language of Lowe and others will probably create a feeling among the workmen which it will be unstatesmanlike to disregard. All I want is to weigh well every step we take, and if it is clear that we have lost the confidence of the House on this subject, not to throw good money after bad, thereby deteriorating both ourselves and Reform in public estimation.

'I doubt whether if we are beaten it will be wise or possible to dissolve, but we ought to say nothing in public or in private which can fetter us in the least on this point. 'Yours sincerely,

'GRANVILLE.'

'I have had a controversial correspondence with the great ittle man, which he began and in which I think I have the best of it, although leaving him with the rejoinder.'[1] Thus wrote Lord Granville from Walmer to his brother and constant correspondent, Mr. Frederick Leveson-Gower. Meanwhile he was being attacked from an exactly opposite quarter. 'From a note I have got this morning,' he writes a few days later—his brother is again his correspondent—'Lansdowne appears to be boiling over about reform, and it will be worse when the redistribution of seats appears. I am almost glad to miss him.' Lord Russell's rejoinder was friendly.

PEMBROKE LODGE, *March* 28, 1866.

'MY DEAR GRANVILLE,—I have many thanks to give you for your kind and considerate letter.

'I never thought you responsible for Lansdowne ; nor for Grosvenor, who is the reverse of his Liberal grandfather ; but I own your preference of Lowe and objection to Stansfeld, and your reluctance to adopt the only measure which could give us a good prospect for the second reading, alarmed me. I am by no means disposed to run the risk of a dissolution, but that is a matter which can only be judged at the moment. The Tories and Grosvenor have decided that there must be a redistribution of seats. I wish to make the measure moderate and not too alarming. 'Yours ever,

'J. RUSSELL.

[1] Lord Granville to Mr. Frederick Leveson-Gower, April 3, 1866.

For several days it seemed more probable that the Government would be defeated. Votes were at a premium, and it was necessary to compass sea and land to make one proselyte. 'A well-known supporter complains,' Lord Granville wrote to Mr. Gladstone, who was accused of being rather lacking in the arts that induce proselytes to enter the fold,

'that you will tell him nothing; and that after his exertions at Oxford, he is hurt at your not communicating with him. It is suggested that if you would take him into a corner, and then tell him that he is a fool, and that he smells disagreeably, or any other not very secret fact, it would have a good effect on him and might possibly affect his vote.'[1]

Lord Russell, recognising the main factor of the situation to be that, once admitting the Cabinet had been right in introducing a Reform Bill, they were bound to see it through, and that with the existing composition of the House of Commons this was probably now impossible, informed the Queen that, in the event of the Bill being defeated on the second reading, he might advise her to dissolve Parliament. Meanwhile he felt the pulse of his colleagues on the subject. Lord Granville dissented, thinking the result of an appeal to the country doubtful, and that an election in the menacing condition of affairs abroad, where the disputes in the Elbe Duchies between the Austrian and Prussian armies were rapidly creating a situation which could only end in war and a great crisis, was a step requiring some very strong justification.

LORD GRANVILLE TO GENERAL GREY.

16 BRUTON STREET, *April* 24, 1866.

'MY DEAR GREY,—When the Queen was good enough to show me the draft of her Majesty's proposed answer to Lord Russell, there was a phrase at the end of it which summed up in favour of dissolution. I ventured to suggest that it would be better to substitute for that phrase one which desired her Majesty's Ministers carefully to consider their advice, and her Majesty's gracious intention of supporting them in the course upon which they might decide.

'I am not in favour of dissolution. Mr. Brand is of opinion that

[1] Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone, April 24, 1866.

we should lose immensely by it, and I am inclined to think that the main question for the Cabinet will be whether they ought to resign, or endeavour to make some concession to the House of Commons.

'If, on reading over the draft of her Majesty's letter, it should appear that the arguments are too strong in favour of dissolution, there would be no objection to softening them, or inserting an argument as a make-weight on the other side; but I should regret much that the answer should not be seen by the Cabinet, as the confidence shown by the Queen would have a very good effect upon Ministers, whether they remain in office or go into opposition. . . .

'Yours sincerely,

'GRANVILLE.'

The Emperor of the French was at this moment again proposing to conjure the dangers of the political situation on the Continent by summoning a Congress in Paris. Lord Russell wished in that event to send Lord Clarendon as principal plenipotentiary; and Lord Clarendon, not being averse to the opportunity of reviving the glories of 1856, showed that at least this idea of Ivan Ivanovitch, as he termed Lord Russell, was far from uncongenial to him. Lord Granville saw many objections and communicated them to Mr. Gladstone, preferring that Lord Cowley, who was still Ambassador, should be the chief plenipotentiary.

LORD GRANVILLE TO MR. GLADSTONE.

BRUTON STREET, *May* 26, 1866.

'MY DEAR GLADSTONE,—The more I reflect on Clarendon deserting us in the middle of the parliamentary session to attend the Congress, the less I like it. The gathering together of such intriguers as the Emperor, Gortchakoff, and Bismarck is in itself an evil. Clarendon here is excellent, communicates more freely with the Cabinet, and carries out their policy more faithfully than any Foreign Secretary I have known. At Paris he will be impulsive, excitable, and much influenced by the atmosphere. He believes he has great influence with the Emperor. I know he has none now, and that the latter resents his pretension of being able to talk him over. It is impossible for a Secretary of State not to take a good deal upon himself, and he will receive approvals, suggestions, and instructions from home, without any means of knowing whether they are personal or proceed from the Cabinet. Cowley is not very clever, will certainly not make a splash or a *bon mot*; but he will act

exactly upon his instructions, and as Ambassador can on all doubtful points refer home, without any of the half humiliation which a Cabinet Minister would feel at never deciding anything. But it is difficult to argue in the Cabinet on that on which Russell and Clarendon evidently are determined, and about which the arguments are personal. 'Yours, G.'

The idea of the Congress was, however, doomed to failure, like most of the plans of the Emperor of the French at this time; and while the European situation steadily grew worse, the fate of the Reform Bill also became more doubtful, although the victory of the Government on the second reading had adjourned the necessity of deciding at once what should be done in the event of defeat. Meanwhile the battle raged in the House of Commons and in the streets. The *Times*—always hostile to Lord Russell—commenced a campaign against the Government, and against Lord Russell and Mr. Gladstone in particular, which was answered by the agitation conducted by the Reform League and by the speeches of Mr. Bright both in and out of Parliament. Lord Granville found himself protesting once more—as on former occasions—to Mr. Delane against the attacks of the *Times* not only on the Reform Bill and the Premier, but also on the Emperor of the French. These attacks Lord Clarendon had signalled from the Foreign Office were causing harm abroad, though he attributed them to Mr. Dasent rather than to Mr. Delane. Mr. Delane replied as follows:—

16 Serjeants' Inn, *June* 1, 1866.

'My dear Lord Granville,—Though the extract you are good enough to send me from the Paris correspondence does not seem entirely uncalled for or unjust, I will write to Paris by this night's post to prevent anything more being written which may possibly annoy the Emperor or excite ill feeling among his friends.

'Your letter affords me an opportunity I have long desired of telling you how deeply grieved and mortified I have been at the cessation of that friendly intercourse on political affairs by which in happier times I so largely profited. It was not perhaps to be expected that the long immunity from party feeling which we enjoyed under Lord Palmerston should continue under Lord Russell, but I at least have done nothing to provoke the bitterness which now prevails, and from which no one suffers more than myself.

'As to Lord Russell, it is no new thing that I should not be among his followers; but I have at any rate left him unassailed, and if I have felt obliged to oppose some of his measures, I have always endeavoured to be respectful to himself.

'In fact I feel that I have nothing to excuse as regards Lord Russell, but much to lament as regards yourself in a state of things most distasteful to yours ever faithfully,

'JOHN F. DELANE.'

The introduction of a Franchise Bill without a Redistribution Bill was, it has been seen, the most effective objection made to the former by the dissentient Liberals. It was now decided, as Lord Russell had originally desired, to introduce a Redistribution Bill, and to ask the House to incorporate it at a subsequent stage with the Franchise Bill in one measure. Meanwhile the Franchise Bill was to be pushed on. For a moment the prospect seemed to brighten, and in the first week of June the Government, having for the present to face the opposition of those only who objected altogether to an extension of the franchise, succeeded in defeating several hostile amendments. 'The triumph of last night,' Lord Russell wrote to Lord Granville on June 8, 'is an ample reward for the checks and crosses we have had to bear.'[1] The Ministers now hoped to be in a sufficiently strong position to open up negotiations with the remaining dissentients in their own party—the section led by Mr. Lowe—and arrive at some compromise in regard to the main point at issue, viz. how far the household suffrage in boroughs should be reduced. Of these negotiations Lord Granville was the natural intermediary, owing to his personal intimacy with Mr. Lowe and his friends

LORD GRANVILLE TO MR. GLADSTONE.

PRIVY COUNCIL OFFICE, *June* 11, 1866.

'MY DEAR GLADSTONE,—Lansdowne said to me yesterday that, owing to the intimate terms on which we were, it was easy to say anything to one another.

'He stated that I must be aware how opposed he and many Liberal peers were to the Reform Bill. They did not wish the present Government to go out, even if they had the power of turning them

[1] Lord Russell to Lord Granville, June 8, 1866.

out, but that it was impossible for them to take any other course than to oppose the Bill in its present shape. He asked whether I should have any objection to be the organ of communication between them and the Government as to the future conduct of the Bill.

'I said that I could not answer his question offhand. I requested him to explain whether he intended that a communication should be made to the Government immediately, or after the Bill had left the House of Commons. He replied that this was one of the points upon which he should like to consult me, if I agreed to act.

'I propose to tell Lansdowne that the Government is most anxious to have free and open communication with all the different sections of the Liberal party, but that I thought his best course would be to ask Lord Russell to give him and his friends an opportunity of talking over the whole matter with him.

'Before doing so, I prefer letting you and Lord Russell know what I propose to do. I doubt whether Lansdowne and his friends would propose anything which would be acceptable to the Government; but although we may decline to agree with them, we ought to neglect no opportunity of showing them great courtesy and confidence.

'Will you forward this note to Lord Russell with any observations that may occur to you? 'Yours sincerely,

'GRANVILLE.'

MR. GLADSTONE TO LORD GRANVILLE.

11 CARLTON HOUSE TERRACE, *June* 13, 1866.

'MY DEAR GRANVILLE,—I send you Lord Russell's reply for perusal. It agrees with you as I understand you—with me—and with Sir G. Grey, to whom I showed your letter. Lord Lansdowne's communication to you is a good sign, but I presume he can't manage his member.[1] 'Sincerely yours,

'W. E. GLADSTONE.'

(*Inclosure.*)

37 CHESHAM PLACE, *June* 13, 1866.

'MY DEAR GLADSTONE,—I am quite willing to concur in opening communications with the enemy when the 7*l.* and rate-paying clauses are disposed of, provided we do not agree to defer the promulgation of our views respecting the redistribution of seats beyond the time when the points mentioned are carried; otherwise the loss of time will cause the loss of the Bill.

'Granville and G. Grey would be the best persons to hear from Lansdowne his views, and report them to us.

'Yours truly,

'RUSSELL.'

[1] Mr. Lowe was M.P. for Calne.

The prospect seemed fair, but Mr. Gladstone's apprehensions proved true. Mr. Lowe was unmanageable ; for he knew that victory was in his hands. His hostile speeches were producing an extraordinary effect in the House of Commons ; and an amendment, moved by Lord Dunkellin to substitute a rating for a rental qualification, was carried against the Government on June 19. Although the question might have been regarded as one of detail and therefore susceptible of compromise, the vote was not unjustly regarded by Lord Russell and Mr. Gladstone as a proof of want of confidence, and they considered that the choice simply lay between immediate resignation and the dissolution of Parliament. Owing to the imminent risk—now amounting almost to a certainty—of war between Prussia and Austria, the Queen was at this time far less inclined to consent to a dissolution than she had been in April. Nor did she desire—and for the same reasons—to change her Ministers at such a moment, for Lord Clarendon as Foreign Minister was *persona grata* at Court and difficult to replace. An attempt was accordingly made to patch up a compromise which would have enabled the Government to remain in office, and would have left the question of Reform shelved for at least a session. The known unwillingness of Lord Lansdowne, Lord Grosvenor, and Mr. Lowe to join any Government formed by Lord Derby and Mr. Disraeli seemed also to give some reasonable hope to those who advocated maintaining the Ministerial *status in quo* for the present. But the situation in reality did not admit of any compromise. Angry passions had been aroused, and it was found to be impossible to frame a resolution on Parliamentary Reform for which the supporters and the adversaries of the now practically defunct Bill could both vote, so as to combine an expression of confidence in the Government with a future willingness to deal with the question of Reform, while at the same time not formally endorsing the leading provisions of the Bill.

Mr. Brand was the principal parliamentary whip of the Liberal party, and he conveyed his views of the situation to Lord Granville as follows :—

MR. BRAND TO LORD GRANVILLE.

TREASURY, S.W., *June* 23, 1866.

'DEAR GRANVILLE,—I forward the inclosed to you by Lord Russell's desire.

'Gladstone and Grey are out of town. I also forward to you a copy of my letter to Russell, to which his is an answer, in order that you may better understand the correspondence.

'I have reason to know that some of the Cave would not swallow the phrase "leading provisions of the Bill."

'As Lord Russell and Gladstone both press for those words, I am constrained to advise Lord Russell against submitting such a resolution, for it would not do in such a crisis to win by a narrow majority; and to recommend that the question of a resolution be left to the spontaneous action of the House.

'I expect that something will be moved, and we shall see whether we can lick it into shape.

'Pray return the inclosed, that I may forward them to Gladstone and Grey. 'Yours truly,

'H. BRAND.'

LORD GRANVILLE TO MR. BRAND.

16 BRUTON STREET, *June* 23, 1866, 8 P.M.

'MY DEAR BRAND,—I have only just received your letter, having been away from home.

'The resolutions which you sent Lord Russell would have satisfied me, it being your opinion that they would be carried by a considerable majority. I will not, however, vote in the Cabinet for any resolution worded in a manner not agreeable to Lord Russell and Mr. Gladstone. They have been the spokesmen as leaders of the Cabinet, and therefore singled out by the public as the persons whose honour is most concerned; but besides there are ties which ought to bind colleagues together, unless they at the time object to what has been said or done in their name. Lord Russell and Mr. Gladstone in my opinion never stated anything (at all events in substance) beyond what they were authorised by the Cabinet to do.

'Fortified by your deliberate opinion as to the failure of a dissolution, I cannot be a party to it. 'Yours sincerely,

'GRANVILLE.'

The negotiations dragged on a few days longer, but the end was seen not to be far off, and on June 28 Lord Russell

definitely placed his own resignation and that of his colleagues in the hands of the Queen.[1]

'I shall be very glad to hear from you,' the Speaker, Mr. Denison, wrote to Lord Granville a few days after these events, 'what you think can be done to restore harmony among the dissolved limbs of the Liberal party.'[2] The difficulties of the Government were also great. 'Dis's speech last night,' Lord Russell wrote to Lord Granville, 'convinced me that he will be involved in inextricable difficulties when he meets Parliament next session. His partisans will be satisfied with nothing less than the old territorial supremacy of the landlords; and that the country will not bear.'[3]

The business of the session was rapidly wound up, and Parliament was prorogued in August.

'I don't know whether you are going abroad [Lord Russell wrote to Lord Granville in September], but I think it as well to inform you of the present state of the opinions of Gladstone, Brand, and myself. We agreed that it was best to wait till next session to see what the Derby Ministry do; in the meantime to do nothing, and then *alors comme alors*. But as far as we could see forward, neither Gladstone nor I are disposed to go on with Beales and Bright, or to go backwards with the party of Lowe and Grosvenor.[4] 6*l.* rating or 7*l.* rental appears to us reasonable, but for my part I should prefer 5*l.* rating to the alternative of 6*l.* or 7*l.* All this is uncertain, for the first question is whether the Tories will propose a Reform Bill. If they do I think we should rather try to mend it in committee than to throw it out. Europe is settling down again for a time, and America is so unsettled that one cannot tell what will become of it all.'

A month later Lord Russell was announcing his own departure for the South: 'We hope to be off to-morrow, and I leave you my lieutenant-general over the kingdom.'[5]

The territorial interest proved more malleable than Lord

[1] The correspondence between Lord Russell and the Queen will be found in vol. ii. ch. xxxii. pp. 413–417 of Sir Spencer Walpole's *Life of Lord Russell*.

[2] Mr. Denison to Lord Granville, July 10, 1866.

[3] Lord Russell to Lord Granville, July 10, 1866.

[4] Mr. Edmund Beales was President of the Reform League.

[5] Lord Russell to Lord Granville, September 26, October 17, 1866.

Russell anticipated, and the history of the year 1867, which saw household suffrage established by a Tory Government, consists mainly in the tale of the *gran rifiuto* of that party on Reform. Lord Derby was said to have justified his apostasy by the phrase that he had at least succeeded 'in dishing the Whigs,' and when Lord Granville publicly charged him with using the phrase, he remained silent.

'Your Lordship may remember the saying [Lord Granville observed], "*I do not care who makes the laws of a country if I can make its songs.*" I do not think that applies very much to this country, which is not governed by its songs. But there is no doubt that in times of political excitement jokes and anecdotes run about the kingdom—jokes and anecdotes invented, perhaps, by ingenious persons and attributed to men of great distinction, particularly if they have a reputation for ready wit and repartee. Well, a few weeks ago an anecdote of this sort was in circulation to the effect that one of the Conservative friends of the noble Lord went and complained to him of the extremely revolutionary character of the measure he was hurrying through Parliament; and it was stated that the noble Earl gave no defence of his measure, but said: "Don't you see how it has dished the Whigs?" Now it may be a very desirable thing to dish the Whigs. I believe the story was fabricated; but some things have been mentioned to-night, and have passed very recently, which make me think that there has been a feeling of this kind towards their political adversaries which, in important particulars, has very much guided the policy of the Government.'[1]

It is no necessary part of Lord Granville's Life to enter into the details of a struggle of which the most stirring events took place in the House of Commons: not that some sharp passages did not occur in the Upper House. An episode of a particularly violent and unusual character on the consideration of the clauses of the Bill relating to the boundaries of the new parliamentary constituencies deserves special notice. Boundary inquiries are apt to disturb the most quiet neighbourhoods, to arouse ancient feuds and create fresh enmities, even when they relate to the comparatively restricted spheres of local and municipal life. It is therefore

[1] *Hansard*, clxxxviii. 1857–1858.

perhaps no cause of wonder if a Boundary Bill affecting parliamentary votes was capable of disturbing even the tranquil atmosphere of the House of Lords. A Royal Commission had been appointed to settle the limits of the borough constituencies under the Redistribution clauses of the Reform Act of 1867. The Commissioners reported early in the following year, and recommended the extension in a great number of cases of the parliamentary beyond the municipal limits, so as to give the suburban population the benefit of the wide suffrage just established for boroughs. These recommendations were in the first instance adopted by the Government in their Bill. Objection was, however, taken to them on the Liberal side in the House of Commons, on the plausible ground that the excision of the large suburban districts from the counties would tend to make the latter more than ever a political preserve for the landed interest. Eventually the clauses were referred to a Select Committee. The principal recommendation of this Committee was one to substitute the former boundaries in the case of the ancient boroughs. An amendment to this effect moved by Mr. Hibbert was eventually carried ; and the Bill passed through Committee in a shape which allowed fifteen of these boroughs, about which the principal controversy had arisen, to retain their existing limits. In this shape the Bill went to the Upper House. It was believed that the controversy was over ; but on the Bill going into Committee, Lord Beauchamp, to the astonishment of the Liberal peers, moved to reinsert the boundaries recommended by the Commissioners in the case of Birmingham and Birkenhead, and still more unexpectedly he received the support of the Government. Against this course Lord Granville energetically protested, on the ground that Mr. Disraeli had assented to the recommendations of the Select Committee as a compromise, and that his undertaking bound the Government in the House of Lords. With Lord Russell he protested against the conduct of the Government as nothing short of a 'stratagem' in using their majority to restore clauses to the withdrawal of which they had consented elsewhere ; and followed by all the Liberal peers

present he left the House. This strong action led to an adjournment of the debate. It was resumed next day. The Lord Privy Seal — Lord Malmesbury — immediately denounced the conduct of Lord Granville as 'disrespectful to the House,' as conduct which might seem 'an insult,' and as merely intended to cause a sensation. Lord Russell retorted that it was clear, from the action of the Government themselves, that they were not easy in their own minds, and that the protest which Lord Granville had made, for which there were precedents in the days of the American and French wars, was fully justified by the adjournment which it had forced on the Government. Other noble lords followed, and the discussion became more and more acrimonious. The words 'dodge,' 'trumpery,' 'falsehood,' and other strong expressions hurtled through the usually placid air, and several persons were heard addressing the House at the same time. One peer used language which, so far as it admitted of any meaning being attached to it, seemed to imply that the Lord Privy Seal was at least capable of knocking down Lord Russell, if it came to a fight, as he was much the taller and bigger of the two. Lord Granville was thereupon heard to ask if the noble lord desired to extend the comparison to the intellectual stature of the two leaders referred to, an observation which led to indignant shouts. Lord Derby declared that he had been present at many warmly and keenly contested discussions in both Houses; but 'so much personal virulence and so many misrepresentations and persevering misrepresentations' he had never heard. The venerable Lord Harrowby at last declared that the present 'miserable debate' had given an opportunity for the display of feelings not in accordance with the 'gentlemanly habits' which usually characterised the House, and he charged the Opposition in the House of Commons with a breach of faith in not accepting the original report of the Commissioners. This breach of faith he went on to say was only equalled by the conduct of Mr. Disraeli in reopening the question of the representation of the people in the Scotch Reform Bill of the current year, to the loss

and disadvantage of England, when he had professed to have finally settled that question in the previous year in dealing with the redistribution of seats. Nothing like this scene had occurred in the House of Lords since the tumultuous debate in 1782 on the Contractors' Bill, which was said by the chronicler to have been 'of two hours' continuance, sometimes degenerating into a desultory conversation, at others bearing all the features of a regular digested debate;' and enlivened by such frequent contradictions between the Lord Chancellor and Lord Grantley that great heat and 'a warmth approaching to asperity' were produced, in which 'other peers joining' was only at last concluded by all the noble disputants assembling round the table, when they 'came to the paragraphs which they had been debating the whole evening.'[1] The mysterious intimation with which the account of this ancient debate concludes suggests—though here again the record is incomplete—that some apposite determination of a similar kind on the part of the contending peers may also have ended the discussion in 1868, for eventually the Boundary Bill passed in the shape in which it had come up from the House of Commons. Lord Granville, in summing up the discussion on behalf of the Liberal peers, was able to point out that his vigorous action in leaving the House with all his friends had been fully justified by the result, as the Government evidently would otherwise not have given way.[2]

With the settlement of the Reform question, the mind of the Liberal leaders reverted to the two great outstanding questions of the condition of Ireland and the education of the people of England.

'I am every day more than ever convinced of the widespread disaffection in this country [Lord Kimberley had written to the Cabinet from Dublin just before retiring from the Lord-Lieutenancy in 1866]. The landowners, who are no doubt all loyal, whether Roman Catholic or Protestant, have no influence with the peasantry, and the priests find that when they try to exert their influence on the side of

[1] *Parliamentary History*, May 6, 1782.

[2] *Hansard*, cxciii. 495–514, 571–587, July 2, 3, 1868.

the law, they are powerless. The whole mass of the peasantry are sullenly or actively disloyal, so are the small tradesmen, the artisans, and the railway and telegraph clerks, porters, engineers, &c. On the other hand the legal class is loyal, and this is a great gain. In England people altogether underrate the potency of the old hatred of the Saxon. Can anything be more disheartening and unsatisfactory? The heart of the people is against us, and I see no prospect of any improvement within any time that can be calculated. You will say what is the use of this Jeremiad? I think it is of this use: the next best thing to curing a disease is fairly to look the evil in the face, and not deceive oneself into crying "peace" where there is "no peace."'[1]

Since then the state of Ireland had become more and more threatening. An agitation partly agrarian, partly revolutionary, was on foot. The strained relations of landlord and tenant, the existence of an Established Church out of harmony with the beliefs of the vast majority of the population, were grievances which it was possible to deal with by law; but where the political movement stopped and the revolutionary movement began it was hard to indicate. Great stores of firearms were known to have been collected in Ireland. The Fenian movement even transferred itself to England, and the project of an attack on Chester Castle was discovered only just in time to prevent it. A rescue of convicted prisoners was devised at Manchester, and an attempt was made to blow up Clerkenwell Prison. As a remedy large districts in Ireland were proclaimed under the Peace Preservation Act; the Habeas Corpus Act was suspended; and the leading newspapers in Dublin were prosecuted for the publication of seditious libels.

The condition of affairs could not be more serious, and in June 1867 Lord Russell and Lord Granville decided to direct the attention of the House of Lords to Irish grievances, especially to the position of the Established Church, and to suggest the revival of the appropriation clauses proposed many years before by Lord John Russell, whereby the surplus revenues of the Church were to be appropriated to secular

[1] Lord Kimberley to Lord Clarendon, November 27, 1865. This paper, the original of which is at The Grove, was circulated to the Cabinet.

uses. These proposals had been rejected by the House of Lords in 1835 and 1836; and the present proposals were another and last opportunity given to the Anglican Church of Ireland to accept reform and save itself as an Establishment. Like other and earlier opportunities, it was lost, and the promises to make 'proposals of a truly liberal character' with which the Government opened the session eventually 'dwindled down' to 'an increase of the salaries of Roman Catholic chaplains in prisons and workhouses.' But if the Irish policy of the Government was feeble, still feebler were their ideas on the settlement of English education, which Lord Russell considered *the* question of the day.

'I have given notice of resolutions [he wrote to Lord Granville at the close of 1867, when a short winter session was about to take place] in order to place on record my opinions upon a subject on which I have worked a long time. I attach no value to Derby's declarations; and if—which I do not expect—he announces any plan on the part of the Government, I shall expect him to do the very reverse of that which he announces. It is part of the "education" of the party to profess the very opposite of what they mean, and is called by Mr. Bromley "a patriotic artifice."'[1]

There is an account of a dinner party in Chesham Place, where Lord Russell summoned a conclave to discuss the question.[2]

[1] Lord Russell to Lord Granville, 1867, undated.

[2] In the *Life and Letters of Lord Coleridge*, ii. 153, there is an account of this dinner.

6 SOUTHWICK CRESCENT, W., *November* 24, 1867.

'. . . I had a very pleasant dinner with Lord John on Wednesday. We were but seven—Lowe, Bruce, Lord Granville, Baines, Jowett, Lord R. himself, and I. He sat me beside him, and was most courteous, and a great deal more kindly and genial than I expected to find him. After dinner he made us a little speech about education, which he (rightly, I think) considers *the* question of the day, and explaining and recommending some resolutions of his which he purposes to move in the House of Lords. I was more struck with his simplicity and a certain nobility of thought about him than with his cleverness. His ideas were commonplace enough, but when Lord Granville said "He feared that forcing some point on might break up the party," Lord R. said, quite simply, that nothing would ever be done if people were afraid of such consequences, and that a great party could not fail more nobly than in trying for the attainment of such an object; but I saw quite enough to be sure that he was very self-*willed*, which perhaps is almost as bad in a party leader. Gladstone's absence from such a

'Johnny remains as you left him—very cocky, restless, and physically strong [Lord Granville wrote to the Duke of Argyll]. Gladstone is very angry about his resolutions. I dined at Chesham Place on Wednesday—an education dinner. Bright was to have come, but did not appear. Lowe, Baines, Jowett, Coleridge, and Bruce were the party. Lord Russell made us a long speech, giving a history of popular education, beginning with the time of Henry IV.

'I stated some of the difficulties which had occurred to Gladstone and me. I got snubbed, and nobody else said anything on that point; but they all told me in the hall that they entirely agreed with me—Lowe more strongly than the rest, but with rather an itch (saving your presence) to rewrite John's resolutions.'[1]

The speech which Lord Russell made on his resolutions was far in advance of the time. 'He spoke with more power and animation,' Lord Granville wrote to the Duke of Argyll, 'than I have heard him.'[2] But vigorous as the speaker still seemed, it was nevertheless a valedictory oration, and perhaps so intended. Lord Russell was now in his seventy-fifth year, and had for some time felt that the hour for retirement was near. But his determination was certainly hastened if not actually caused by a sudden return in the autumn of the fainting fits which had frequently attacked him in his youth, but had ceased in his maturer years. These fits were now followed by evident signs of failing strength and diminished powers, and the Lord Russell of 1868 was not the Lord Russell of 1867.[3] On December 26 he informed Mr. Gladstone by letter of his intention to give up the leadership of the party whenever his old rival, Lord Derby, retired from the lead of the Government. To Lord Granville, he made the same intimation as to Mr. Gladstone.

meeting was as curious as Lowe's presence, but, I suppose, Lord R. had settled both on mature consideration. I was rather sorry to see that he looked upon himself as beyond doubt still our leader, for I don't think the party in general could bear him again as Prime Minister. . . .'

[1] Lord Granville to the Duke of Argyll, November 22, 1867.

[2] *Ibid.*

[3] Lord Clarendon mentions these fits in a letter to Lord Granville of October 29, 1868.

LORD RUSSELL TO LORD GRANVILLE.

PEMBROKE LODGE, *January* 2, 1868.

'MY DEAR GRANVILLE,—On a deliberate view of my past labours, my present age, and the future anxieties of the State, I have made up my mind not again to take office if it is now offered to me. I have communicated this decision to Mr. Gladstone, who acquiesces in the most friendly manner. I have only to say that I shall be glad, while Derby is the head of the Ministry, to help the party in any way that can be most useful. 'Yours affectionately,

'RUSSELL.

'P.S.—This last sentence seems ambiguous. What I mean is that if a *new* Government is formed, my assistance, though always willing, would hardly be required.'

LORD GRANVILLE TO LORD RUSSELL.

16 BRUTON STREET, *January* 3, 1868.

'MY DEAR LORD RUSSELL,—Your letter took me by surprise. There is no one in England who has so clear a right to rest as you, if you wish it, or think it necessary for your health. There seems, however, no chance at present of a change of Government, and it is impossible to say what may be the state of the country, and of parties, when this Administration comes to an end.

'All younger politicians must envy you, who through storm and sunshine have built up a great political reputation. But that fact imposes on you great responsibility. I am glad to learn that in any case you do not intend to make any change in your present position.

'Yours affectionately and gratefully,

'GRANVILLE.'

From Italy, Lord Clarendon wrote on the situation thus created.

'I suppose that there will be nothing to do in England except watching the undeserved success of the Tories, and the hopeless disunion of the Whigs, which, as far as I am concerned, may be done as well at Rome as in London. You must be a far better judge than myself, but I cannot discover a germ of approximation towards Gladstone, or an attempt to discover how he can be done without; there seems a determination to distrust him, and to find fault with whatever he does or does not do. His genius and eloquence enable him to soar high above the heads of his party, who are always

suspicious of what he may devise when he gets into higher or unknown latitudes.

'If Derby gets one or two more such attacks as the last, he will not much longer be able to render his party the cohesive service of his name, and then will come the question of "Disraeli" or "not Disraeli." His party would make no objection, but Parliament and the public being less interested may be more doubtful, and if he thinks the pear is not ripe, I expect he will propose a Duke, and that Richmond will be he. Disraeli is bent on being First Minister, and his chances of it would be gone if he took office under Stanley. I wonder whether you will agree with me, or whether you have a better tracing of the future? If so, please let me have it. I was horrified at the announcement that Ivan Ivanovitch was about to address Chich. on the state of Ireland,[1] and I am sure that your unavailing efforts will be useless to prevent it, but I conclude that if he did not get occasional relief he would die of suppressed epistle.'[2]

Lord Clarendon's forecast proved correct. Lord Derby resigned early in 1868, and Mr. Disraeli became Prime Minister. A few minor offices were redistributed, but beyond the change in the Premiership and the substitution of Sir Hugh Cairns as Chancellor for Lord Chelmsford, the composition of the Cabinet was not substantially changed, Some idea, however, of trying to place his Government on a broader basis seems—at least for a moment—to have floated before the mind of the new Prime Minister.

Dr. Quin was at the time a physician of considerable reputation and much personal popularity in London society, in which he was a conspicuous figure, especially in political circles which he frequented irrespective of party, and through Dr. Quin Mr. Disraeli tried to feel his way towards Lord Granville as a possible colleague.

LORD GRANVILLE TO MR. GLADSTONE.

16 BRUTON STREET, LONDON, W.,
February 13, 1868.

'MY DEAR GLADSTONE,—I write, in case I do not find you alone to-morrow, for your *private* information.

[1] In 1868 Lord Russell published a letter on the state of Ireland addressed to Mr. Chichester Fortescue.

[2] Lord Clarendon to Lord Granville, February 4, 1868.

'Disraeli called to-day on a friend of his and mine, not badly chosen for the purpose. He talked over the political position, the prosperous state of the Government in many respects, but their immense difficulty in the House of Lords. He thinks it impossible that Derby should go on in his present state of health, and he knows of no one who could be put in his place, who would have the will and the ability to adapt the tone of speaking in the House of Lords to the line of policy in the House of Commons.

'He then paid me some compliments, spoke of the pleasant social relations on which we had always met, suggested that it would not be difficult for us to come to some agreement on future political measures, and desired our friend to find out whether I would join him, and if so how many and which of my friends I should require to bring! 'Yours, G.'

LORD GRANVILLE TO DR. QUIN.

BAGINTON HALL, COVENTRY, *February* 26, 1868.

'MY DEAR QUIN,—A thousand thanks. Your note was the first intimation of the important events. It is an immense thing for Dizzy, with all the obstacles in his way, to have accomplished. If Dizzy speaks to you again about me, you had better say that you have communicated with me; that I am much flattered by his good opinion; that I have a great admiration for his personal qualities; and that his courtesy to me in all matters of business and in our social relations would make it agreeable to me to be brought into connection with him; but there are many reasons which would oblige me to decline his Administration, and would make me of little use to him were I to do otherwise. . . . 'Yours sincerely,

'GRANVILLE.

CHAPTER XIX

MR. GLADSTONE'S FIRST ADMINISTRATION

1868

MR. GLADSTONE now took one of those great resolves which make the landmarks of history. Throwing aside all ideas of concurrent endowment, at the end of May he brought forward a series of resolutions, by which he sought to pledge the House of Commons to the complete disestablishment and disendowment of the Irish Church. These resolutions were carried after four days' debate by 328 to 272, and a 'Suspensory Bill'—in other words, a measure to suspend all further promotion in the Irish Church pending a fresh settlement—was thereupon introduced and carried against the Government by a large majority. These events led to a correspondence of a peculiarly delicate character. It was suggested by the Opposition that the resolutions ought to have been moved in both Houses of Parliament, and not in the House of Commons only, and that they ought to have been previously submitted to the Crown. Special objection was taken to the third resolution, which proposed that an Address be presented to her Majesty praying that, with a view to the purposes of the two previous resolutions, 'her Majesty would be pleased to place at the disposal of Parliament her interest in the temporalities of the archbishoprics, bishoprics, and other ecclesiastical dignities and benefices in Ireland and in the custody thereof.'[1] It was suggested that the course adopted was not only unconstitutional, but also disrespectful to the Crown.

[1] *Hansard*, cxci. 33.

LORD GRANVILLE TO MR. GLADSTONE.

WALMER CASTLE, DEAL, *April* 9, 1868.

'MY DEAR GLADSTONE,—I have received the inclosed from Bessborough.[1]

'My first impression was to do nothing. I am, however, afraid that if the Queen hears nothing but from one side, her displeasure with you may be the beginning of many difficulties of a serious character.

'Pray look at the accompanying draft of a letter. I have written it with a wide margin, in order that you may correct, revise, and omit. I am not quite sure of some of my facts.

'Before, however, giving yourself any trouble, consider whether it is better to write or not. 'Yours, G.'

MR. GLADSTONE TO LORD GRANVILLE.

HAWARDEN, *April* 11, 1868.

'MY DEAR GRANVILLE,—Many thanks for your letter, and for the inclosures which I return herewith.

'I think you are the best and the only competent judge as to the expediency of your offering an explanation of your own share in the resolutions relatively to their supposed bearing upon the Queen.

'If you write—and I in no measure dissuade you—I agree in thinking it should be to the Queen herself and to no one else, and I would suggest that you might with propriety make it quite clear—

'1. That you do this on your own behalf and not on mine.

'2. That you do it as having been cognisant of the proceedings, I think of all the proceedings, preliminary to the introduction of the resolutions.

'I will describe my case as I see it myself. Where there is smoke there is fire, and there is probably something at the bottom of all these rumours about her Majesty's displeasure. But my opinion of the Queen's good sense, good feelings, and constitutional knowledge leads me only to receive them with an enormous discount. Though I do not feel myself entitled to offer any explanation to her Majesty, yet if I received any apparently authentic intimation, however indirect, that it was conformable to my duty, I should then do it.

'I should do it assuming this to be a case in which error at all would be a very serious fault, and in which error by neglect would justify any terms of blame, however severe, in the case of a man who

[1] The letter is quoted in Lord Granville's letter to the Queen below (April 13, 1868).

now, whatever else he may be, is reckoning the fourth decade of years since first he served the Crown.

'But I should not conceal my decided opinion that as the fault would have been a most grave one, so the charge brought against us, if it has been brought by the confidential advisers of the Crown in error, and still more if in light-minded or factious error, exhibits them too as guilty of a grave offence.

'This is my view of the position; and as to the matter itself I am really curious to know what *is* the course which it is supposed ought to have been taken in order to satisfy the principles of the Constitution, and the claims of personal loyalty and faith.

'Ever sincerely yours,

'W. E. GLADSTONE.'

Lord Granville's letter to the Queen ran as follows:—

LORD GRANVILLE TO THE QUEEN.

WALMER CASTLE, *April* 13, 1868.

'Lord Granville, with his humble duty, ventures to approach your Majesty on the subject of a letter he has received from an intimate friend, who writes:—

'"It is positively said that the Queen is very angry with you and Gladstone for having permitted resolutions touching her Majesty's prerogative to be submitted to the House, without previously submitting them to her Majesty. I took little notice of it, but I find the Queen's views are the constant topic of the Conservatives, so I thought I might as well tell you."

'Lord Granville would regret your Majesty's disapproval of any political step which he may take, but that would be as nothing compared to your Majesty thinking him capable of any want of respect to your Majesty. It would, however, be presumptuous for him to defend himself, if he felt certain that any accurate statement had been made to your Majesty respecting the third resolution, upon which your Majesty could exercise your Majesty's judgment and constitutional knowledge.

'Lord Stanley in the debate said he would refer to the third resolution, but he did not do so. No more did Sir Stafford Northcote nor Mr. Disraeli. Mr. Hardy in a short sentence said that the resolutions were unconstitutional, that the Address should have been moved in both Houses. This Mr. Gladstone denied, and showed that the course he had taken was according to precedent.

'But Lord Granville finds the case stated to this effect in the Government newspapers:—

'"Mr. Gladstone proposes to direct by a resolution of the House

of Commons that no further appointments be made in the Church of Ireland, and to request by an Address that her Majesty will place the patronage at the disposal of the House of Commons. He intends by a resolution of the House to cause the Queen to leave unfulfilled duties imposed upon her by the Constitution and recognised by her in the Coronation oath."

'If a similar statement was made to your Majesty, your Majesty cannot but be annoyed and indignant with those who have concurred in Mr. Gladstone's resolutions. On this account Lord Granville attaches some weight to the information this friend has sent him.

'Lord Granville has no right and no authority to speak for Mr. Gladstone; but having been cognisant of all the preliminaries of the resolutions, he can state the facts as follows:—

'Mr. Gladstone, after the declaration of policy respecting the Irish Church by the Government, came to the conclusion that the state of Ireland and the almost unanimous opinion of the Liberal party, in accordance with his own, which for some years he has not concealed, made it necessary that he should take action on the subject in the House of Commons.

'An abstract resolution was bad, and it would have been impracticable to ask the Government to introduce a Bill dealing with the whole subject this session. An Irish M.P. had announced his intention of moving a Bill to suspend Episcopal appointments in the Church of Ireland. This course appeared to Mr. Gladstone and to friends whom he consulted at different times to be the best mode of proving the intentions of the Legislature, and conciliating the public opinion of Ireland towards this country.

'Mr. Gladstone took especial pains to ascertain how this might be done in the most respectful manner to your Majesty. He consulted some of the late law officers and other authorities. It was proposed by one of his late colleagues to do what the Government papers say he has done. This proposal was not adopted, as wanting in respect to your Majesty. It was thought entirely out of the question for the House of Commons, without the concurrence of the other branches of the Legislature, to ask your Majesty to suspend the exercise of your Majesty's prerogative. It was believed that this could only properly be done by your Majesty permitting a Bill to be introduced, to be considered by both Houses of Parliament, and if passed by them to be submitted to your Majesty for the Royal Assent. Mr. Gladstone found a precedent in the Church Temporalities Act.[1] He took the same words, but expanded them to make them more respectful.

[1] 3 & 4 Will. IV. c. 37, 4 & 5 Will. IV. c. 90.

'The third resolution asks your Majesty not to suspend your Majesty's present action, but to give your Majesty's formal assent to a Bill being introduced and considered by Parliament.

'It is competent for either branch of the Legislature to make such a request. But it would be unprecedented for any individual member of the Opposition to approach your Majesty for such a purpose. Any confidential communication might place your Majesty in a great difficulty. Your Majesty, since the change of your Majesty's Government, has been as kind to Lord Granville as ever, and in a way that if possible makes him feel the kindness more. But your Majesty has not spoken to Lord Granville of politics, nor would he have ventured to do so to your Majesty.

'Lord Granville may be wrong in not knowing what course ought to have been taken in order to satisfy the principles of the Constitution, and the claims of personal loyalty and faith to your Majesty. He cannot be mistaken as to Mr. Gladstone not only intending no disrespect to your Majesty, but as to his not erring, if he has erred, from inattention or indifference, which in such a case would deserve the severest blame. The third resolution was adopted by him and his friends, after great consideration, as the most respectful course which in their opinion could be taken towards your Majesty.

'Lord Granville presents his humble and respectful apology for troubling your Majesty with this long and ill expressed letter. He believes, however, that your Majesty will appreciate the feelings which have dictated it.'

To this communication the Queen sent a gracious answer: 'She had had too many proofs of Lord Granville's devotion to her service to allow her to believe for a moment that he could have been a party to anything which could by possibility imply a want of respect for her,' nor had the Queen 'ever mentioned Lord Granville's name in connection with this question.' The reports were incorrect. She at the same time acknowledged that she feared that the question of the Irish Church being mixed up with a party movement might make the ultimate settlement more difficult; but if any reports had got abroad as to her sentiments, it was only, perhaps, what was to be expected when the subject under discussion was of such vital interest and importance, and had been brought forward so unexpectedly; even those who brought it forward admitting that it could not be settled in this Parliament Lord Granville, her Majesty added, 'will

not be surprised if the Queen adds that, on a subject of this nature, she feels bound to communicate his letter and a copy of her answer to Mr. Disraeli.'[1]

To this communication Lord Granville replied as follows :—

LORD GRANVILLE TO THE QUEEN.

April 18, 1868.

'Lord Granville presents his humble duty to your Majesty, and begs to thank your Majesty for your Majesty's gracious answer to his letter.

'It would be unjustifiable on the part of Lord Granville to take up your Majesty's time with any argument on the opportunity of Mr. Gladstone's resolutions.

'Lord Granville thinks that perhaps he ought to apologise again to your Majesty for having troubled your Majesty with a letter, particularly as it was based on a rumour which turns out to be incorrect on the only point on which Lord Granville had any claim to approach your Majesty. He could, however, hardly do so with sincerity. He has felt too much pleasure at the great kindness with which your Majesty has so fully reassured him on a matter which had caused him deep anxiety.

'Lord Granville begs respectfully to add that he perfectly understands your Majesty's intention to show the correspondence to Mr. Disraeli.'

The Government were laying on the table of the House of Lords a timid measure to deal with the English education question, a measure mainly intended to strengthen the position of the voluntary schools connected with the Church of England. Some of their supporters, after their defeat on the Church resolutions, were talking about an appeal to the nation on the old franchise. Others, however, asked why they did not at once resign.

'You asked a question about education [Lord Russell wrote to Lord Granville], and the answer satisfied my mind that the foolish measure of the Government will not be persevered with. I propose to ask, with a proper preface on the motion for adjournment on Friday next, "whether it is intended in future to dispense with the constitutional maxim that the Ministers of the Crown ought to have the confidence of the House of Commons, or whether that maxim is

[1] The Queen to Lord Granville, April 16, 1868.

only kept in abeyance till after the next general election?" I believe the threat of a dissolution at present is only kept hanging *in terrorem* over the heads of timid members of the House of Commons.'[1]

The Suspensory Bill soon passed the House of Commons, and on Lord Granville, at Lord Russell's own wish, the difficult task fell of introducing it in the House of Lords. The speech which he made greatly raised his reputation, and may perhaps be regarded as his most successful parliamentary effort. But the fate of the Bill was a foregone conclusion, for if the Liberal peers came up to the last man to vote for it, the Tory peers also mustered in full strength to record their votes in a division which was felt to be the prelude of greater events to come; for the final issue could not be fought out till after the elections. On November 11 Parliament was dissolved. 'These elections,' Mr. Lowe wrote to Lord Granville, 'will be a complete Waterloo for the Tories; but how long will the Whigs survive them?'[2] Mr. Lowe himself had found a refuge in the newly created constituency of the University of London. The University of Oxford it was known was certain to eject Mr. Gladstone from the seat which he had so long occupied, and he was seeking a political shelter in one of the divisions of Lancashire. Thence he wrote to Lord Granville, sending a copy of his address. 'I have taken all the pains I could give it,' he wrote; 'but the affair is a serious one, and probably it is full of faults.'[3] Simultaneously Mr. Disraeli issued a manifesto to the people of the United Kingdom in the shape of an address to the electors of Buckinghamshire.

'What a difference [Lord Clarendon wrote to Lord Granville from Wildbad] between the addresses of the Jew and the Gentile. The former aims at the pompous affirmations of a Queen's Speech; but except in the part where he has to inflame religious passion, it is more like a circular of "Moses & Co." proclaiming their world-wide celebrity, and that parties will be better and more cheaply fitted at their establishment than at any other house in town.

[1] Lord Russell to Lord Granville, May 23, 1868.
[2] Mr. Lowe to Lord Granville, September 12, 1868.
[3] Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville, September 16, 1868.

Gladstone's is the firm and purposelike language of a man girding up his loins for a mighty encounter. To my surprise and delight, it offers few opportunities for hole-picking.'[1]

Mr. Gladstone was regretting that Lord Russell was not still a member of the House of Commons, and engaged like himself in courting a constituency with a population of two hundred thousand, so as 'to keep him quiet.'[2] For Lord Russell was still suffering from what Lord Clarendon called 'suppressed epistle;' in spite of the publication of his letter on the state of Ireland to Mr. Chichester Fortescue.

'Mere fidget, however irrational [Mr. Gladstone said in a letter full of pathos and sympathy], is of little consequence, until the time comes for practical resolutions. Here is, however, sadder material for contemplation. A great reputation built itself up on the basis of splendid public services for thirty years. For almost twenty it has, I fear, been on the decline; and now the process threatens to be rapid. The movement of the clock continues: the balance-weights are gone. I hope I am not too gloomy about it, but such is my view.'[3]

Lord Russell only a few days after writing to Mr. Gladstone that he intended in future merely to watch the process of affairs 'with great interest, looking out from the loopholes of a retreat from the great world,'[4] was proposing to move a whole set of resolutions in the House of Lords on the vexed question of the proper method of dealing with the surplus revenues of the Irish Church. His proposals suggested that he had determined to adopt a detached position on the retirement of his old rival, Lord Derby; and claimed the right to revive his old advocacy of a certain measure of concurrent endowment, even although his appearance in the chair of a great meeting at St. James's Hall earlier in the year had been interpreted at the time as an acceptance of Mr. Gladstone's policy. 'A pedantic equality,' he now wrote to Lord Granville, 'I do not aim at. It is establish-

[1] Lord Clarendon to Lord Granville, October 11, 1868.
[2] Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville, November 19, 1868.
[3] *Ibid.* October 16, 1868.
[4] Mr. Gladstone quotes the words in the above letter.

ment which causes inequality.'[1] Mr. Gladstone himself was desirous of treating the Church as leniently as possible in the matter of property, but leniency to the Church was bound to involve some equivalent concession to other religious bodies.

'I have no doubt [Lord Granville had written to him in August] of what I believe to be your plan being the best, viz. to give back to the Church (besides all recent endowments) the churches, parsonages, and glebes (of the latter enough for personal use, but never sufficient to relet): to give the same or an equivalent, once for all, to the Roman Catholics and Presbyterians. This would probably exhaust the amount; but if it did not, I should give something to lunatic asylums, hospitals, &c. I doubt about giving anything for educational purposes, as it would only be a relief to the Consolidated Fund. But can you carry anything which resembles endowment of the Catholics?'[2]

Lord Granville noted that among others Viscount Amberley, Lord Russell's eldest son, in the midst of pledges of devotion to Mr. Gladstone, was promising never to consent to any new endowments. 'I leave the patient under your soothing treatment,'[3] Mr. Gladstone replied; and to Lord Russell accordingly Lord Granville addressed himself as follows:—

WALMER CASTLE, *October* 10, 1868.

'MY DEAR LORD RUSSELL,—A thousand thanks for your two letters and the inclosures.

'I have availed myself of your permission to copy the resolutions. It is much easier to reflect upon anything which is in writing.

'If we can settle in time what should be done, why should not a Bill be introduced? I see some of your resolutions are not so precise as the clauses of a Bill would be.

'Your plan of disestablishing the Church by a certain date, and appointing a Commission to report upon the necessary preliminary steps, appears to be good; but I object to leaving 250,000*l.* a year to the Church. To do this, and to take away the Maynooth grant and the Regium Donum, would be inconsistent with our declarations that we intended to establish religious equality in Ireland.

[1] Lord Russell to Lord Granville, October 3, 1868.
[2] Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone, August 29, 1868.
[3] Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville, October 16, 1868.

'I doubt the expediency of finally adopting any plan till after the debate and division, and the subsequent completion of the new Ministry. 'Yours sincerely,

'GRANVILLE.'

Lord Russell did not intend to abolish the Regium Donum and the Maynooth grant. There was, however, another and for the moment a more serious difficulty of a personal character which it required all Lord Granville's skill to adjust. Although Lord Russell had abandoned all wish or expectation of again being Prime Minister, he was nevertheless proposing to invite the Liberal peers to dinner at the commencement of the autumn session of Parliament, thereby apparently intimating that he still considered himself technically to be the leader of the Liberal party, at least in the House of Lords; although Lord Granville had understood that the committal of the Suspensory Bill into his hands a few months before had been intended to mark the time and hour of Lord Russell's final retirement.

In October Lord Russell was on a visit to Lord Granville at Walmer. His strength was evidently failing. He appeared incapable of any physical exertion, and talked of Mr. Gladstone as the future Prime Minister; saying nothing, however, to indicate retirement on his own part,[1] and spending most of his time in capping anecdotes with another veteran, the ex-Chancellor Lord Chelmsford.

'Lord Russell was here two days [Lord Granville wrote to Mr. Gladstone], deaf, but most amiable and agreeable—delighted with the Spanish Revolution, and generally absorbed in politics. He stated his plan of resolutions, which I had misunderstood. But you will (or will not) be surprised to hear that he now wishes to leave to the Church all their lands, only taking from them their tithe rent charges. In the course of conversation he said that it would devolve upon you to form a Government, but he gave no signs of retirement from political life. He told me that the great disappointment of his life had been Grey's refusal to join his Government, which had prevented his name going down in history as the repealer of the Corn Laws. On going away, he invited me to his parliamentary dinner on the opening of the session.'[2]

[1] Lord Granville to Lord Clarendon, October 4, 1868.

[2] Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone, October 6, 1868.

It used to be a favourite adage with the Rev. William Rogers, the Rector of Bishopsgate, whose genial character and broad theology made his presence the delight of Liberal circles, that when there was a difficulty 'you had better give a dinner.' But there are exceptions to every rule, and this dinner of Lord Russell's was one of the exceptions.

'Lord Russell's present proposal about the Irish Church property [Mr. Gladstone wrote to Lord Granville] amazes me. But probably it will soon be superseded by another. More surprising still is his dinner at the commencement of the session. Are you committed? What is really almost necessary seems to be that that evening should be given to a real consultation on the Address, and the amendment which I take it for granted we must move. . . . With your incomparable temper you bear all these inconsequences; but I am afraid the public inconvenience will be great.'[1]

The position was evidently awkward.

'Johnny's dinner is a difficulty [Lord Granville replied]. If he persists in giving one, I do not know how you can avoid giving another. I am not sure that you ought not in any case. John Russell's power of self-assertion is one of the strong points of his nature, which, as some one said, is a compound of a giant and a little child. This power has given him great success at times, and may do so again. It is only a guess, but I suspect that his present ambition is to be sent for by the Queen (which he expects, but I do not); to have the credit of magnanimously recommending you to her Majesty; to build on that recommendation a right to dictate a policy by which his name will be connected with the disestablishment of the Irish Church, and to have a potential voice in the selection of the persons who are to form the new Administration.

'Palmerston told me that Johnny had complained bitterly of his forming the Government by a caucus, i.e. in consultation with his colleagues, as they one after another joined him. "I expected that you and I would meet together, and settle everything." Palmerston added with that peculiar twinkle he sometimes had in his eye: "A pretty mess I should have been in with Johnny alone, and objecting to all his proposals with no one to back me up." . . .

'You had better propose to give a large dinner, and either go on with it, or then suggest that both should be given up for a small conclave.

[1] Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville, October 8, 1868.

'Johnny is physically very weak. It is a question whether he could give his dinner, and make a speech the next day. It is sad to write in this way. . . .

'. . . Do you wish me to write saying that I understand you wish to have a select meeting on the eve of the Queen's Speech—that when Lord Russell asked me to dinner, I presumed that you and he had each agreed to give one—that there would be advantages in this, coupled however with the great difficulty of selection in both cases; but if you declined giving a dinner, it appeared to me impossible that the only semi-official meeting should be one of a small number of peers. It would give great offence to our friends in the Commons.' . . .

'The important thing,' Lord Granville said, 'is that Johnny should not appear to the astonished public to be the leader of the Opposition, and that he should not be allowed to treat with you as *puissance à puissance* about your future policy, or the selection of your colleagues. As to his leading in the House of Lords till the present Government are out, I see no objection to it. There will be some disadvantage in his doing so after your Government is formed, but there would be considerable compensations, and I at all events should not be entitled to object.'[1]

Eventually the difficulty was got over by a tactful discovery on the part of Lord Granville that Mr. Gladstone's house was being painted, and that it was therefore impossible for Mr. Gladstone to give a dinner to the Opposition leaders in the House of Commons at his own house. It was out of the question that there should be a dinner to the Opposition peers but no dinner to the Opposition commoners, and both dinners ought, it was suggested to Lord Russell, to be abandoned in consequence. Lord Russell was induced to accept this view, but he then proposed that the projected meeting of the leaders of the Opposition in both Houses should be held at his house, which was not being painted, 'presuming that the smell of paint being bad for friends at dinner would not be innocuous to friends in council.'[2] 'The point as to paint is neatly put,' Lord Granville observed, who evidently thought that some

[1] Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone, November 11, 13, 24, 1868.
[2] Lord Russell to Lord Granville, November 20, 1868.

rather pretty fencing was going on, and that Lord Russell had scored. He was none the less persuaded that the Opposition would resent the meeting being held anywhere except at Mr. Gladstone's own house, and this view Lord Russell eventually accepted.

LORD GRANVILLE TO LORD RUSSELL.

WALMER CASTLE, *November* 21, 1868.

'MY DEAR LORD RUSSELL,—Thanks for telling me that your banquet is postponed. There would have been some advantage in two parliamentary dinners, but the difficulty of selection in both cases would have been great.

'Some little time ago, Gladstone wrote to me that he had asked you to meet a select few at his house immediately upon the receipt of the Queen's Speech, and invited me. I told him I would come in case your dinner was put off in consequence of his having none. I am therefore engaged unless he puts me off.

'The Liberal candidates have adopted with a wonderful unanimity your declaration that he must undertake the job, and it is possible in these circumstances that he would prefer having the little meeting in his own house, and that the Commons would like it better.

'Yours sincerely,

'GRANVILLE.'

LORD RUSSELL TO LORD GRANVILLE.

PARK LANE, *November* 23, 1868.

'MY DEAR GRANVILLE,—I had understood from Gladstone that he could not give a *parliamentary dinner, as his house was painting*, and I concluded (rashly, it appears) that as paint would not agree with guests at dinner, it would be bad for friends in council. But unless the smell of paint is very bad, I shall of course go to his house on the 14th.

'Yours truly,

'RUSSELL.'

It was at this time that Mr. Gladstone published the *Chapter of Autobiography*, in which the world was taken into the confidence of the author on the matters which had influenced his mind in the gradual evolution by which the statesman, once the hope of the stern and unbending Tories, had at length become the leader of the advanced school of political Liberalism. The moment was appropriate. To Lord Granville, Mr. Gladstone sent the proofs of the pamphlet and asked for his observations.

LORD GRANVILLE TO MR. GLADSTONE.

WALMER CASTLE, DEAL, *October* 14, 1868.

'MY DEAR GLADSTONE,—After the attention you paid to some of my superficial suggestions, I feel nervous about saying anything on the *Chapter* which you have been good enough to send me.

'I had conflicting feelings in beginning to read it. I have a passion for autobiography. No work, certainly none of fiction, ever interested me so much as the somewhat uneventful autobiography of Gibbon. I had naturally the greatest curiosity to learn the history of the workings of your mind, in the change which has taken place since the publication of your book; but I had also a feeling that the less a person in your position publishes the better; that the explanation was unnecessary, and would only lead to fresh attacks. In this state of mind I set to work. You appeared to me happy in your motto and introduction: excellent in your argument why you should publish.

'The description of your book gave me little pleasure, for the obvious reason that I never liked or quite understood it[1]; but when I came to your personal history, I never read anything which delighted me more—so candid, so simple, and so clear—it is perfectly unanswerable.

'Your description of a phase of the history of the English Church is one of the most eloquent and feeling passages I know. It has more than the merits of Macaulay and none of his defects. It will give many votes to Roundell Palmer if he stands for the University.

'Your acknowledgment of the power of the Nonconformists is graceful, and will make some amends to them for your showing yourself so passionate an Oxonian and Churchman.

'Then comes your answer to Macaulay, and the statement of what you now think the true theory of the conscience of a State. I had been reading, and running at full speed. I had been bowling along the straightest and smoothest of roads at thirteen miles an hour, and here I began to think the road rougher. I asked myself whether you did not exaggerate the difference between you and Macaulay and if you did not, whether I perfectly understand your meaning. I began to fear after so prosperous a journey that you were a little in difficulty, and that we should be balked of our trot up the Avenue.

'You may judge of my pleasure when I found myself bounding along again on the beautiful and well-gravelled approach of the last two pages.

[1] The allusion is to the *Essay on Church and State*.

'I hope you understand from the foregoing silly account of "the workings of my mind" while reading your proofs, that I think the *Chapter* admirable, and am all for its publication.

'I remember that you are writing your opinions, and not mine. I do not ask you to omit or alter the answer to Macaulay, but I should like you to read it over once more before you finally send it to the publisher. 'Yours, G.

'P.S.—I hope you are not knocking yourself up by overwork. I was glad to hear the other day that you had cut down a tree. Not so a Constitutionalist present, who exclaimed, "There is nothing he would not destroy."'

Although the Liberal party was victorious at the polls, the Liberal leader was defeated in South-west Lancashire, but a simultaneous return for Greenwich saved him from lacking a seat in Parliament. On his defeat, Lord Granville wrote to him as follows:—

LORD GRANVILLE TO MR. GLADSTONE.

WALMER CASTLE, DEAL, *November* 25, 1868.

'MY DEAR GLADSTONE,—However philosophically I spoke of it, I cannot feel so. I am exceedingly grieved, and am afraid that you are a good deal disappointed. There is no doubt that the obligation, however tiresome, of making so many speeches has had an immense effect upon other elections, and it may be good for you in the midst of your great national triumph to have a slave in your chariot. The only practical disadvantage is the reviving of hopes amongst some of those who wish to save the Irish Church, and a possible encouragement to Salisbury and others to make a real fight in the House of Lords. For all House of Commons purposes, the majority will be too large. I hear but do not believe that Dizzy has said that Salisbury would have a great game leading the Tories, and he in leading the discontented Radicals. 'Yours, G.

'P.S.—The *Autobiography* looks and reads very well in its drab coloured outside. Did Bright bind it for you?'

All speculations as to the composition of a future Liberal Government, and as to the intention of the Government to face Parliament, were quickly swept aside. Events marched rapidly. Mr. Disraeli accepted the verdict of the country as decisive, and resigned. Some thought the Queen would send

for Lord Russell, others that she would repeat the experiment of 1859 and send for Lord Granville. But it was Mr. Gladstone who was at once sent for. Lord Russell, Lord Granville wrote to Lord Stanley of Alderley, as yet not conscious of the want of physical strength which to others was so obvious, probably at first wished for office; but at the last moment he wisely refused the seat in the Cabinet without departmental duties which Mr. Gladstone pressed upon him.

'The snapping of ties [Mr. Gladstone wrote to him] is never pleasant; but your resolution is probably a wise one; and I rejoice to think that there are ties between you and us which cannot be snapped. Perhaps it is selfish of me to think of and mention them, rather than to dwell upon those ties which inseparably associate your name with so many great and noble passages in the history of your country.'[1]

There were those who, not being aware of what had passed, accused Lord Granville and Mr. Gladstone of having treated the veteran Liberal leader with discourtesy. It was asserted that by immemorial constitutional custom the Queen on the resignation of Mr. Disraeli ought in the first instance to have sent for Lord Russell, the last Premier of the party, before she sent for Mr. Gladstone, and that it was owing to some intrigue that this had not been done. The reply is easy. The Constitution knows no such custom. The Sovereign at such times has a free hand and an unfettered discretion, although the outgoing Prime Minister in such circumstances, if invited to do so, but not otherwise, advises the Queen whom to select as his own successor. The Queen on this occasion simply recognised the verdict of the country—spoken in unmistakable language—when she determined to send for Mr. Gladstone.[2]

Discontent—of a more justifiable kind—was caused by the exclusion of Mr. Charles Villiers from the new Cabinet. Intimately associated in the public mind with Mr. Bright and Mr. Cobden as one of the great champions of Free Trade, Mr. Charles Villiers also enjoyed a wide reputation in society

[1] The correspondence will be found in vol. ii. p. 435 of Sir Spencer Walpole's *Life of Lord Russell.*

[2] See Mr. Gladstone's observations, *Gleanings*, i. 38, 230.

owing to his caustic but not unkindly wit. Some little weaknesses in Mr. Gladstone's own panoply had perhaps been too often the object of these winged shafts to make it altogether a matter of astonishment that the inner circle of his admirers sought to justify the exclusion by a sudden discovery that it was a great principle of the Constitution, that two brothers could not sit at the same time in the same Cabinet, regardless of the fact that Lord Clarendon and Mr. Villiers had both been members of the Cabinets of Lord Palmerston and Lord Russell. Whatever may have been the real reasons of Mr. Villiers's exclusion, the friendship of long standing between him and Lord Granville made it the most disagreeable event to Lord Granville himself in these transactions, in which other old friends also had to be sacrificed. Lord Clarendon was greatly hurt, and at one moment seemed determined not to accept office in consequence. The situation was in reality saved by the good temper of Mr. Villiers himself, which, only half concealed by his dry sense of humour, always lay behind the hard hitting with which he flavoured alike debate and conversation. Somebody once reflected on his carelessness in dress, and on the fact that the buttons on his shirt front were generally conspicuous by their absence. Lord Granville, to whom the remark was made, observed, 'No, he always keeps the buttons to put on the tips of his foils.'[1] It was this quality which prevented Mr. Villiers, if not quite able to conceal a sense of grievance, from ever degenerating into a 'candid friend' in Parliament, or becoming the inhabitant of a political cave.

Another of the *fuor usciti*, Lord Stanley of Alderley, showed that his sense of injury was deep, and Lord Strafford —one of the greatest of the Whig magnates—was expressing his indignation in no measured terms that his son George Byng, Viscount Enfield, was not given a place. These, however, were but a few of the complainants, and against all and several of these Lord Granville had to defend Gladstone. At such moments, he once said that it was necessary 'to

[1] Sir Algernon West, *Recollections*, i. 199.

have the skin of a rhinoceros, and to be perfectly impervious to rebuffs.'[1]

LORD GRANVILLE TO LORD STANLEY OF ALDERLEY.

16 BRUTON STREET, *December* 5, 1868.

'MY DEAR BEN,—The only certain appointments are:—

Chancellor	Page Wood
Foreign Office . . .	Clarendon
Colonies	Self
India (probably) . . .	Argyll
Exchequer	Lowe
Army	Cardwell
Navy	Childers.

'Bright positively refused last night, but after a strong and genuine resistance, chose the Board of Trade to-day.

'Lord John has been very friendly, but has declined an unofficial seat.

'Gladstone is now in the full difficulty of re-election. I have put aside all personal feelings and friendships, but have urged with all my strength what I thought were real personal claims founded on able administration, and on practical use in Parliament.

'Nothing is yet decided, but I think it is not unlikely that I may fail, not from the want of recognition of merit but from the difficulty of places. 'Yours, G.'

COLONIAL OFFICE, *December* 10, 1868.

'MY DEAR BEN,—Gladstone has just shown me your letter. He was much and justly touched by the tone of it. I really cannot tell you how grieved I am for private and public reasons. However absorbing political struggles may be, the pleasure of being engaged in them depends almost entirely on being associated with intimate friends. You have been a very true one to me, and your assistance has been invaluable. I shall miss it every day in the House of Lords. Lord Russell is not aware of the want of physical strength, which is obvious, and I believe wished for office. George Grey and Somerset are, I believe, delighted to be out. Halifax has (with some reluctance) refused Ireland, which will probably be offered to Spencer.

'Yours, G.'

'Bright,' the letter concluded, 'promises to be a very useful and reasonable member of a Cabinet.' His acceptance

[1] To Mr. Gladstone, November 28, 1882.

of office was perhaps the most striking feature in the new arrangements. It was the outward and visible sign of the definite junction between the more advanced section of the old Liberal party and the Radicalism of the school of Mr. Cobden. The Tadpoles and Tapers of London Toryism went about asserting that none of the 'gentlemen' of the Liberal party would associate with the great tribune of Birmingham, and Lord Derby was freely quoted by them, though without any kind of authority, as having said that the Queen would never receive Mr. Bright as a minister. Lord Granville marked his opinion by walking down Parliament Street from the Cabinet arm in arm with the new President of the Board of Trade to the House on the day of the meeting of Parliament, and piloted the new minister on his first journey to Osborne.

LORD GRANVILLE TO MR. GLADSTONE.

OSBORNE, *December* 31, 1868.

'MY DEAR GLADSTONE,—We took charge of Bright at Waterloo. He is rapidly becoming a very loose character. He flirted violently with my wife all the way down, describing to her his wife, his family, and his home—reading verses to her, and quoting similar passages in the older poets—denouncing luncheons, and then eating enormously of mayonnaise, and drinking goblets of claret, which he declared was so light, it must be "Gladstone's."

'We had a fine passage, during which he left us to ourselves, and was mean enough, I am much afraid, to pump the open-hearted captain on the extravagances connected with the royal yacht. He was much pleased with the royal footman who was waiting for us at Cowes, and asked whether they were really hired by the length. All went well till our entry at Osborne. He was really angry with the footman at the door for transferring his carpet bag to a man in an apron. In vain we pleaded the division of labour, the necessity of the former preserving his red coat and his white stockings from the dirt of luggage. "If I had known the fellow was too fine to take it, I would have carried it myself." He stayed in Lady Granville's sitting room till past dressing time. —— came in. Nothing could be more striking than the contrast between the two men. Both a little vain, and with good reason to be so—but one so guileless in his allusions to himself, and the other showing it enveloped with little artifices and mock humility—one so intrinsically a gentleman, and

so ignorant of our particular society; the other a little vulgar, but a consummate master of the ways of the *grand monde*. The combined influences of Bright's connection with the press, the platform, and the House of Commons, together with the great simplicity in which this combative and able man was brought up, and which he has maintained in his social and family habits, give his conversation a singular flavour.

'He told us he only informed his wife two days ago of his visit here, and of her almost reproachful answer—"It seems strange you should be going where I cannot follow."

'I called for him at dinner time—his dress was irreproachable, after he had readily agreed to take off a pair of bridal white gloves. He was rather pleased, quoted his tailor's approval of tights, and acknowledged he had promised to rehearse the costume before his wife and daughter.

'The beginning of dinner was awful—the Queen with a sick headache and shy—Princess Louise whispering unintelligibly in my ear, and Lady Clifden shouting ineffectually into the still more impenetrable receptacle of sound belonging to Charles Grey. Bright like a war horse champing his bit, and dying to be at them. At last an allusion to children enabled me to tell Bright to repeat to her Majesty his brother's observation, "Where, considering what charming things children were, all the queer old men came from." This amused the Queen, and all went on merrily. She talked to him for a long time, and the old *roué* evidently touched some feminine chord, for she was much pleased with him; and saw him again the next morning. Without unnecessary depreciation of our enemies, it is probable that she is not insensible to the charm of sincerity and earnestness.

'We then retired to the Household at tea, and Bright was by no means dashed, when Alfred Paget addressed the company as if through a speaking trumpet: "Well, I never expected to see John Bright *here*, winning his money at Blind Hookey."

'Yours, G.'

The Liberal majority in the House of Commons was large, and on the immediate issue of the moment thoroughly united. The Government could claim that it comprised in its ranks all that was strongest in the various sections of the party. The Opposition was weak in numbers and discredited in reputation. Their leaders were at variance, and speculations were even possible whether eventually Lord Salisbury himself might not join Mr. Gladstone There had been other specu-

lations connected with Lord Salisbury's name. Lord Mayo's recent appointment as Governor-General of India had not been, in the first instance, well received by the public. 'If you cancel Mayo's appointment,' Lord Granville had written to Mr. Gladstone in September, 'what do you think of Salisbury? It would be a teat taken away from our pigs, but it would weaken the Opposition. It would be acknowledged as a good appointment, and the offer would take away all flavour of a job, even if he refused it.'[1] 'I think the suggestion an excellent one,' Mr. Gladstone had replied.[2] But the same fate which once before had decided that Lord Robert Cecil should not become Clerk to the Privy Council, had also settled that Lord Salisbury should not be Viceroy of India, and reserved him for higher fortunes. Lord Mayo's appointment was *not* cancelled.

The detached position occupied by Lord Salisbury was an additional trouble to his own party and a valuable asset to the Government, whose difficulties, notwithstanding the prestige of Mr. Gladstone, then at the height of his power and reputation, were not to be underrated. The Cabinet were about to deal with the Irish question on new and bolder lines than any which had yet been attempted; the English education question was pressing for settlement; the Nonconformists were determined to secure the abolition of University tests; a large and active section of the party demanded the introduction of the ballot, the abolition of purchase in the army, and large changes in the law relating to land tenure and local government. These were but a few of the reforms for which the majority of the newly enfranchised electors and those who represented them were pressing. But the forces of resistance, though at the moment impaired and divided, might yet prove strong, and no very intimate agreement existed on some of the proposed measures, especially in regard to education, between the leaders of the party and large sections of their own followers.

'I am much obliged [Lord Shaftesbury wrote to Lord Granville, on December 28] by your wishes for a happy New Year. I wish the

[1] Lord Granville to Mr. Gladstone, September 28, 1868.
[2] Mr. Gladstone to Lord Granville, October 8, 1868.

same to you. But what a tempestuous ocean you have embarked upon. What shoals and quicksands. I have no trust in Gladstone and Bright; but I have a special distrust in Derby and D'Israeli. Your seas and your waves are roaring. May God be at the helm; for be assured, my dear friend, that no merely human skill will save the British Empire from utter shipwreck.'[1]

Whether Lord Shaftesbury's gloomy vaticinations went beyond the mark, it was certain that whatever might be the case at home, abroad there were dangers which each day tended to increase. Lord Granville had long since recognised that the position and prospects of the French Emperor were becoming more and more precarious, and that the fall of the Empire was certain to be followed by a European catastrophe.

'I never knew a time [he had written to Lord Clarendon at the end of 1867] when things looked so bad for him. It almost looks as if, after spending magnificently in every direction, the bad quarter of an hour was come. Discredited in his foreign policy; a financial crisis; a bad harvest; a universal disposition to blame; as much abuse from the Imperialists out of place as from the Legitimists and Orleanists, and the Ministers hating and abusing each other to their hearts' content!'[2]

Nor had matters improved since 1867. The danger was that the Emperor, knowing himself to be in peril, would find the temptation irresistible to seek a path out of his domestic difficulties in a foreign war. Prussia was the obvious antagonist. Great reliance was, however, placed on the pacific intentions of the King, who at the end of 1868, just before the formation of the new Government, had explained his own views of the situation in a few words to Lord Clarendon. His talk was interesting 'because its tone was eminently pacific. He said that he was determined neither to give nor take offence; and that, if war there was to be, the undivided responsibility of it should rest with France.'

'He told me [Lord Clarendon added] that he had seen the Emperor of Russia, who had agreed with him that there did not now exist in Europe the shadow of a pretext for war. I gave some reasons why

[1] Lord Shaftesbury to Lord Granville, December 28, 1868.
[2] Lord Granville to Lord Clarendon, November 7, 1867.

the Emperor Napoleon was pacific, and he admitted them; but said, "No one can tell when supposed dynastic interests may make war necessary to avert attention from interior troubles. It was that fear which kept them all armed to the teeth, and prevented the re-establishment of confidence."'[1]

The King spoke sincerely. But there was a minister at Berlin more powerful than the King. Meanwhile for another eighteen months armed peace was allowed to continue in Europe.

[1] Lord Clarendon to Lord Granville, August 25, 1868.

END OF THE FIRST VOLUME

PRINTED BY
SPOTTISWOODE AND CO. LTD., NEW-STREET SQUARE
LONDON

DA
565
G72F5
v.1
cop.2

Fitzmaurice, Edmond George Petty-Fitzmaurice 1st baron
The life of Granville George Leveson Gower, second earl Granville, K.G.

PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE
SLIPS FROM THIS POCKET

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
LIBRARY